



March 13, 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
Response to Scoping Comments

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 January 13, 2015, as supplemented on January 21, 2015, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the Project, initiating a scoping period through February 27, 2015, to solicit comments on the scope of the environmental review for the Project from interested stakeholders.

Pursuant to Section 157.21(f)(9) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.21(f)(9) (2014), PennEast submits, in Appendix A hereto, its response to comments posted to the above-referenced docket on or before March 6, 2015. PennEast acknowledges that additional comments have been and will likely continue to be posted to the docket after March 6, 2015. PennEast will continue to review and log such comments and will address new concerns raised in documents posted to the docket after March 6, 2015, either in a supplemental response, if necessary, or in the draft resource reports or certificate application for the Project. With respect to comments posted to the docket after March 6, 2015, that were submitted during the five scoping meetings for the Project, including comments documented in the scoping meeting transcripts posted to the docket after March 6, 2015, PennEast will review and log such comments and file a supplemental response to address additional concerns raised in such comments that have not already been addressed herein, if any.

Appendix A provides four tables that identify the commenter, describe the issue or concern raised, and provide a response or cross-reference to address the specific concern. Specifically, Table 1 of Appendix A responds to comments from federal, state, and local agencies, Table 2 responds to comments from non-governmental organizations, Table 3 responds to comments from affected landowners and abutters, and Table 4 responds to comments from other individuals. Each table groups the comments by issue and specifically identifies the commenters that raised the particular issue.

PennEast is committed to addressing concerns raised by landowners and other stakeholders in this Pre-filing review process and the related certificate proceeding and will

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

March 13, 2015

Page 2

continue to work with stakeholders throughout the environmental review of the Project. All stakeholders will continue to have opportunities to provide comments on the Project.

Should you have any questions concerning this filing, 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)

Appendix A

Table 1: Federal/State/Local Agency Comments January 13 – February 27, 2015

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 1 - Luzerne County Flood Protection Authority; Frenchtown Environmental Commission; West Wyoming Borough</p>	<p>Flood Protection Systems</p>	<p>Extensive efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to critical infrastructure such as local flood protection systems. PennEast is working with federal and state agencies as well as local authorities to identify and avoid potential impacts to flood protection systems.</p> <p>A January 28, 2015 letter filed with FERC by the Luzerne County Flood Protection authority states that the Project does not appear to intersect or interfere with the Authority's flood control facilities, operations, or flood fighting activities (Bellemann).</p> <p>Section 2.3.1.3 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate statewide floodplains and flood hazard zones in the Project area.</p>
<p>FSL 2 - Delaware Township; West Amwell Township; Holland Township; City of Bethlehem; Bethlehem Authority; Durham Township; Kingwood Township; Lower Saucon Township; Bucks County Commissioners; Senator Shirley K. Turner; Wyoming Borough; USFWS; Moore Township; USEPA; Kidder Township</p>	<p>Surface Water Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NJ C-1 streams • PA Exceptional Value Waters • Tributaries and headwaters • Wetlands • Lakes • Ponds • Streams • Stream flow sources • Delaware River Watershed • Susquehanna River Watershed 	<p>PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Additionally, it is planned that dry crossing techniques, such as dam flume pipes and dam and pump, bores and horizontal directional drill (HDD) will be used to cross many waterbodies. The use of these best management practices (BMPs) will maintain the designated water quality, and there should be no long-term impact to water quality downstream of any of these features. PennEast plans to construct and restore these areas in accordance with the rules and regulations of various regulatory agencies and will maintain compliance with these requirements thorough environmental inspection during the construction and restoration time period.</p> <p>Stream crossings for the pipeline will be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and reviewed and/or approved by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), County Conservation Districts, River Basin Commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. PennEast will employ BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate the sensitive streams and waterbodies in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>FSL 3 - Holland Township; Lower Nazareth Township; Lower Saucon Township</p>	<p>Geologic Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sinkholes • Sinking streams • Caves • Abandoned mines 	<p>The high grade steel to be used to manufacture the pipeline will minimize sinkhole risks. Piping, such as that planned for the Project, can withstand loss of subgrade support of over 100 feet in length without being compromised. Should a sinkhole occur, PennEast would immediately address the situation by properly shoring the pipeline.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 4 - Kingwood Township; West Amwell Township; Hopewell Township; Frenchtown Environmental Commission; Durham Township; Bethlehem Authority; Kidder Township; Lower Saucon Township; West Wyoming Borough; Moore Township; USEPA; Towamensing Township;</p>	<p>Groundwater Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contamination • Recharge ability • Sources • Flow rate 	<p>PennEast is using a critical issues assessment process to identify sensitive resource areas, and then work with engineering to avoid or minimize potential impacts. In combination with the use of BMPs, these efforts will maintain designated groundwater quality within the Project area.</p> <p>During construction, equipment will be inspected on a daily basis for integrity. Fueling activities will be restricted as specified in a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. In the unlikely event of a leak or breach in the pipeline, the natural gas would rise to the ground surface and dissipate in the air. There are no liquids in the pipeline that would be released to groundwater.</p> <p>The Project will not impact groundwater recharge ability, groundwater sources, or impede flow rate.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate existing groundwater resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>FSL 5 - Holland Township; Kingwood Township</p>	<p>Steep Slopes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% or greater 	<p>Side slope construction methods will be put in place for all steep slope sections of the pipeline. These areas will require an additional 25' of temporary work space to allow for safe construction.</p> <p>Prior to construction, PennEast will be required to submit detailed erosion and sediment control (E&S) plans to both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and/or conservation districts. Upon approval, PennEast will employ related BMPs during construction to prevent erosion in accordance with the approved plans, as well as applicable regulations and permits. During this E&S design process, each slope will be evaluated individually by licensed engineers and the appropriate approved BMPs will be employed to maintain compliance with all regulations and permits.</p> <p>Resource Report 1 and the erosion and sediment control plan will address the requirements for steep slopes.</p>
<p>FSL 6 - Holland Township; Kingwood Township; Hunterdon Agriculture Board; West Wyoming Borough; Kidder Township; Lower Saucon Township; West Amwell Township; USEPA; Towamensing Township</p>	<p>Erosion and Sedimentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream crossings • Wetland crossings 	<p>PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Prior to construction, PennEast will be required to submit detailed erosion and sediment control (E&S) plans to both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and/or county conservation districts. Upon approval, PennEast will employ related BMPs during construction to prevent erosion in accordance with the approved plans, as well as applicable regulations and permits. After restoration, PennEast is responsible for maintaining the permanent rights-of-way (ROW) while the pipeline remains in operation. Federal and state regulatory agencies will inspect and monitor the area to maintain compliance with all regulations and permits.</p> <p>Construction plans for the Project will be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and reviewed and/or approved by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), conservation districts, and River Basin Commissions. PennEast will employ approved BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>PennEast's E&S and Site Restoration Plan will be included in its FERC application as Appendix E.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 7 - Durham Township; Holland Township; Towamensing Township</p>	<p>Fisheries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trout populations • Trout reproduction 	<p>PennEast is evaluating existing conditions and making efforts to avoid or minimize impacts to fisheries resources in the Project area. Additionally, it is planned that dry crossing techniques such as flume pipes and dam and pump will be used to cross waterbodies, as well as horizontal directional drill (HDD) and bores, where necessary. The use of these BMPs will maintain the designated water quality, and there should be no impact to downstream fisheries of any of these features. PennEast plans to construct and restore these areas in accordance with the rules and regulations of various regulatory agencies and will implement thorough environmental inspection during the construction and restoration time period.</p> <p>Section 3.2 of Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate the fisheries resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>FSL 8 - Holland Township; Kingwood Township; Frenchtown Environmental Commission; Kidder Township; Williams Township Land Preservation Board; Lower Saucon Township; Delaware Township; USFWS; USEPA; Moore Township</p>	<p>Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds • Reptiles • Mammals • Habitat 	<p>Consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state agencies are currently ongoing regarding rare, threatened and endangered species (including protected birds, reptiles, and mammals), associated habitats and protocols for field surveys. Potential habitats have been mapped from federal and state databases. Where practicable, the pipeline route is being adjusted to avoid protected habitats. Preliminary field surveys are being conducted where access permission has been granted. If it is determined that the pipeline route cannot be adjusted to avoid areas of concern, other avoidance and mitigation measures will be evaluated, such as, construction using bores and HDD, timing restrictions and other previously approved techniques and will be addressed through the environmental permitting and FERC Environmental Impact Statement process.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate the threatened and endangered species in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>FSL 9 - Holland Township; Kingwood Township; Frenchtown Environmental Commission; West Wyoming Borough; Delaware Township; Kidder Township; Carbon County Commissioners; Frenchtown Environmental Commission; Lower Saucon Township; Williams Township Land Preservation Board; Senator Shirley K. Turner; USFWS; NJ State Agriculture Development Committee; Moore Township; Carbon County; Kidder Township Supervisor</p>	<p>Preserved natural areas/open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Resource Areas • High Integrity Forest Areas • Deforestation • Sourland Mountains • Wildlife habitat • Designated natural areas 	<p>Following construction of the pipeline, disturbed areas will be stabilized and reseeded in accordance with the seeding recommendations of the local Conservation District or land managing agency. Trees and other woody vegetation will be allowed to re-vegetate naturally within the temporary pipeline construction ROW and extra workspaces. Additionally, PennEast will implement restoration measures in accordance with its agency-approved E&S and Site Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate vegetation and habitat resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p> <p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will evaluate various land uses in the Project area including Natural, Recreational, and Scenic Areas and Public or Conservation Land.</p>

FSL 10 - Clinton Township; Delaware Township; Hunterdon Agriculture Board; West Amwell Township; Wyoming Borough; South Hunterdon School District; Wyoming Borough Council; Lower Nazareth Township; Towamensing Township

Cultural and Historical Resources

- Rosemont Ridge Agricultural Development District
- Revolutionary War encampments
- Native American artifacts
- Covered Bridge Historic District
- Swetland Homestead
- Wyoming Monument

In developing the proposed route for the pipeline, PennEast officials considered potential impacts to culturally sensitive areas, including historic buildings. During the permitting process, PennEast will continue to consult with the various state and federal agencies that oversee these areas and work with them and landowners to avoid or minimize impacts to culturally sensitive areas.

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, PennEast will identify cultural resources within the Project area of potential effect (APE) and make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places to FERC and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (54 U.S.C. § 306108). PennEast is making extensive efforts to avoid cultural resources during the siting process.

PennEast has contacted members of fifteen federally recognized Native American tribes to determine concerns with the Project. A number of tribes have responded with determinations of 'No Effect' from the proposed project.

Section 4.5 of Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources will present the results of cultural resource investigations in the Project's APE and provides avoidance and mitigation measures adopted by the Project.

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 11 - West Amwell Township; Wyoming Borough; South Hunterdon School District; Wyoming Borough Council; Lower Nazareth Township; Kingwood Township; Lower Saucon Township; Lower Nazareth Township; USEPA</p>	<p>Public Safety</p>	<p>PennEast will comply with the pipeline safety standards established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) (49 CFR § 190-199). Pipelines are the safest, most environmentally-friendly and efficient mode of transporting energy, according to PHMSA. Data shows that while natural gas demand has increased, serious pipeline incidents have decreased by 90 percent over the past three decades alone, primarily as a result of significant efforts by pipeline companies to upgrade and modernize their infrastructure. Transportation by pipeline is the safest mode of transportation.</p> <p>Safety is PennEast's highest priority when designing pipelines. PennEast adopts design features and operating practices that meet or exceed stringent industry and regulatory standards. PennEast will regularly walk the PennEast Pipeline, conduct leak surveys and send sensor equipment through the line to make sure integrity has not been compromised. PennEast will continuously monitor (24/7/365) how much gas is transported through the system, operating pressures and temperatures throughout the system, and other critical operating data. This is done in real-time through our gas control center. Should any unusual data surface, PennEast will immediately dispatch field personnel to address the issue and protect the community. Additionally, the pipeline will be clearly marked at all road crossings, creeks, property lines, and fence lines to minimize the potential for third-party damage. PennEast will be a member of the national 1-Call system (Dial 811) that requires anyone performing excavations to call 3 days prior so that the line can be located and marked in the area of the excavation.</p> <p>PennEast is designing the Project to exceed federal safety regulations in many important areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pipe material will meet and generally exceed the API-5L requirements; • Class 2 pipe will be installed in all Class 1 locations in order to increase safety factor; • 100 percent nondestructive inspection of mainline welds (for example 49 CFR § 192 requires only 10 percent of the welds to be tested in Class 1 locations); and • Prior to placing the line into service, the pipe will be hydrostatically tested at a maximum pressure that will exceed industry standards identified in 49 CFR § 192. <p>Community services will be properly prepared for emergencies that may arise due to the Project. Local emergency response and management personnel will receive emergency response training prior to the Project being placed into service and on an ongoing basis thereafter. Necessary information and instructions regarding the facilities will be provided to local emergency response and management personnel. A plan will be in place for coordination between PennEast and local emergency response and management personnel in the event of an incident. The operations of the community services in the Project area are unlikely to be negatively impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Resource Report 11 – Reliability and Safety will evaluate the overall safety of the Project through construction and pipeline operation and presents the extensive safety measures, emergency procedures, and oversight that will be adopted and implemented for the Project.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
FSL 12 - West Amwell Township	Seismic Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthquakes 	<p>PennEast has conducted a Seismic Hazard Analysis for the pipeline, including along the Ramapo fault zone in New Jersey. Initial results of the analysis found that the probability of surface fault hazard to the pipeline was deemed well below the probabilities considered for engineering design and therefore insignificant.</p> <p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, and flash flooding. A complete analysis of the geology in the Project area will be presented in Resource Report 6 – Geology.</p>
FSL 13 - Durham Township	Hazardous Materials Disturbance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical dumping sites • Hazardous material sites • Industrial waste 	<p>A comprehensive search of federal and state databases was conducted to identify known areas of contamination and their status under applicable cleanup programs. Sites of concern were mapped and have been avoided during the siting process. Communications are ongoing with regulatory agencies. Any undocumented sites that are found during the surveys or construction process will be avoided, or addressed in accordance with applicable regulations and the Spill Prevention and Pollution Control Plans.</p>
FSL 14 - Clinton Township; NJ Conservation Foundation; NJ Agricultural Department; Lower Saucon Township	Lands conserved with public funds	<p>Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to preserved open space and other conserved properties. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to reduce fragmentation of preserved areas. A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with relevant agencies, conservation groups and land owners to develop suitable measures to minimize disturbances to preserved open space and conserved lands, and to fairly compensate for potential impacts. Effects to preserved open space and conserved lands will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored to their original condition following construction activities in accordance with FERC restoration conditions and restoration plans approved by the relevant agencies.</p> <p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will provide a summary of all public and conservation lands crossed by or located within the vicinity of the Project and quantify potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 15 - Mercer County; National Park Service; Moore Township; Towamensing Township</p>	<p>Potential impacts to national, county and state parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appalachian National Scenic Trail • Lower Delaware Wild and Scenic River • Captain Jon Smith Chesapeake • National Historic Trail • Delaware Canal 	<p>Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to national, county, state, and local park lands. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline). A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.</p> <p>Permanent impacts resulting in the conversion of forested areas to permanently cleared areas will occur within the width of the permanent ROW. These permanent disturbances will be mitigated for as required by FERC and in accordance with the applicable state regulations, dependent on the site specific conservation/preservation program, and may, in some cases, include off-site land compensation.</p> <p>No sections of river crossed by or located within 0.25 miles of the Project are included in the National Wild and Scenic River System or are designated as Pennsylvania Scenic Rivers.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with the relevant agencies to develop suitable measures to minimize disturbances to public lands, trails, and recreational areas. Consultations with various federal, state, and local agencies are ongoing.</p> <p>Effects to public lands will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored to their original condition following construction activities in accordance with FERC restoration conditions and restoration plans approved by relevant federal, state, and local agencies.</p> <p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will provide a summary of public lands crossed by or located within the vicinity of the Project and quantify potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures.</p>
<p>FSL 16 - West Amwell Township; Hopewell Township; Kingwood Township; Bucks County; NJ Agricultural Department; Delaware Township; Lower Nazareth Township; Lower Saucon Township; USEPA</p>	<p>Agricultural Lands</p>	<p>On any pipeline ROW, proper restoration is required and monitored throughout the FERC process. After construction, the ROW will be regraded, seeded, and temporary erosion control devices will be installed, according to laws, regulations and improved BMPs. As a BMP for farming, when the ROW is prepared for construction, any topsoil that is present is carefully stripped off the top and stockpiled on the edge of the ROW, separate from any excavated subsoil. Once pipeline construction is completed, the topsoil will be returned to the ROW and restored to the original grade. Farming activities can resume as they did before construction and yields should not be materially affected in the long term.</p> <p>PennEast will employ third party environmental inspectors to monitor all construction and restoration activities to maintain compliance with all E&S plans, FERC certificate order conditions, other environmental permits and approvals and environmental requirements in landowner easement agreements.</p> <p>PennEast will work with farmers to measure both pre- and post-construction crop yields until such time as yields have reached pre-construction levels. PennEast will compensate farmers for adverse impacts to crop yields caused by the Project and will work diligently to eliminate the impact. Agricultural lands will be restored using approved, modern mitigation techniques designed to reestablish pre-existing productive use of the agricultural lands, which is typically within 3 years following Project completion.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
FSL 17 - Kidder Township; Clean Air Council; USEPA; Carbon County; Kidder Township Supervisor	Air and noise quality from above-ground compressor station	<p>Potential impacts to air quality will be evaluated in accordance with PADEP and FERC regulatory requirements. Emitting equipment used at the compressor station will meet or exceed PADEP Best Available Technology (BAT) emissions standards and guidelines. Impacts will adhere to all applicable state and federal regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Noise impacts associated with the project will be limited so that the Project will meet all applicable regulatory requirements. A complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air and noise in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project will be included in PennEast's environmental analysis as Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality.</p>
FSL 18 - West Amwell Township	Safety concerns with co-locating with existing transmission line ROWs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical circuit between pipeline and electric transmission lines 	<p>Standard safety practices for installation of a pipeline near a power line will be utilized during construction to ensure safety of all personnel. These safety measures include training and daily safety “tailgate” discussions, static straps on vehicles, grounding of pipe strung along the ROW, utilization of safety spotters, and other measures.</p> <p>In addition to safety during construction, a detailed engineering review will be conducted to design mitigation measures in areas where the pipeline and power lines cross and/or parallel to alleviate static buildup on the pipeline. The installation of these AC mitigation measures is commonly used by all pipeline operators to ensure the safe operation of pipelines that are in close proximity to electric transmission facilities.</p>
FSL 19 - Kingwood Township; Lower Saucon Township	Indoor air contamination from radon	<p>Concerns have been raised about the concentrations of radon in natural gas produced from certain wells. The Commission has addressed the radon concentration of natural gas in multiple certificate proceedings, including recently in CP14-96-000. The Environmental Impact Statement in that proceeding cited to a July 2012 study of natural gas samples collected from Texas Eastern and Algonquin pipelines from the Marcellus shale gas fields (Anspaugh, 2012). The study found that radon concentrations in natural gas pipelines are significantly less than the average indoor and outdoor radon levels. Based on all of the available studies, including the Anspaugh study, the Staff concluded that the risk of exposure to radon is not significant. Environmental Impact Statement at 4-244, Docket No. CP14-96-000 (Jan. 23, 2015). The Commission confirmed this determination in its certificate order in CP14-96 issued on March 3, 2015.</p>
FSL 20 - Kingwood Township; City of Bethlehem; Bethlehem Authority; Hopewell Township; City of Lambertville	Drinking water quality	<p>Construction of natural gas pipelines occurs at depths that do not typically impact drinking water resources or wells. The majority of the pipeline will be installed 3 to 6 feet below ground level, whereas drinking water resources are typically much deeper. However, in accordance with FERC requirements, PennEast will identify public and private groundwater supply wells or springs within 150 feet of the proposed construction work area and conduct pre- and post-construction well monitoring and testing. PennEast has consulted state drinking water agencies, municipal agencies, and federal and state databases to identify the locations of potable wells and springs within the 400-foot study corridor. In addition, PennEast is identifying private wells and springs not listed in publicly available databases through civil and environmental surveys and by direct communications with potentially affected landowners. During construction, equipment will be inspected on a daily basis for integrity. Fueling activities will be restricted as specified in a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. In the unlikely event of a leak or breach in the pipeline, the natural gas will rise to the ground surface and dissipate in the air. There are no liquids in the pipeline that would be released to groundwater. If it is determined that permanent impacts have occurred to a well due to the construction of the Project, rendering the water unsafe for drinking, PennEast will replace or provide an alternate water source.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate ground water resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 21 - Kingwood Township; Hopewell Township; Delaware Township; Lower Saucon Township</p>	<p>Wetlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Clean Water Act 	<p>During development of the route corridor where access is granted, PennEast will identify environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands through field surveys and other publicly available data. Once wetlands data from field surveys are collected PennEast will attempt to avoid as many of these sensitive areas as practicable through re-routes or engineering techniques. To the extent wetland areas cannot be avoided, PennEast will then consider construction methods to minimize any impacts to wetlands. Ultimately, any impacts to wetlands that result from construction will be restored and/or mitigated in accordance with the Clean Water Act as administered through FERC and the US Army Corps of Engineers, as well as Pennsylvania and New Jersey state regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Section 2.5 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate the wetland resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>FSL 22 - Hopewell Township; City of Bethlehem; Delaware Township; Carbon County</p>	<p>Socioeconomics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land value • Disruption of industry • Traffic patterns 	<p>The PennEast Project requires a 50-foot permanent ROW and, on average, an approximately 50-foot temporary construction workspace for a nominal 100-foot-wide construction corridor. With a permanent footprint of 50 feet, the rest of the tract will remain undisturbed and available for development after the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>There are millions of miles of pipelines throughout the country and, thus, there are a considerable number of properties near pipelines. A report by Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc., which was prepared in 2001 for the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, Inc., evaluated the impact of natural gas pipelines on real estate in four separate and geographically diverse areas, including two suburban areas and two rural areas crossed by one to multiple natural gas pipelines. The study concluded that there was no significant impact on property sales located along natural gas pipelines due to the pipeline size or the product carried. Additionally, other studies have reached similar conclusions: PGP Valuation Inc. (2008) for Palomar Gas Transmission Inc.; Ecowest (Fruits, 2008) for the Oregon LNG Project; Diskin, Friedman, Peppas, and Peppas (2011); and Hansen et al. (2006).</p> <p>PennEast will compensate landowners fairly given readily available data on local property values and considering the potential use of the affected areas. An early and ongoing dialogue with property owners will allow PennEast to route the pipeline in mutually acceptable areas where practicable to minimize impacts to properties. This process has been successfully employed for decades.</p> <p>The construction of major road crossings and most high-volume state and local road crossings will be accomplished using conventional boring techniques, such as horizontal direction drilling. This is done specifically to minimize disturbance to existing roadways and decrease the effect on traffic patterns.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
FSL 23 - Hopewell Township	Blasting	<p>To the extent where bedrock is encountered, PennEast would first attempt to use mechanical methods such as excavation or ripping to remove bedrock, where practicable. Blasting will be employed if other methods cannot successfully remove rock to the appropriate depth. Blasting is done in compliance with all applicable permits and regulations. PennEast will implement a project blasting plan that will provide specific procedures, safety measures, notification processes, and other required protocols that will be employed during blasting activities while utilizing only licensed and qualified contractors. Proper notifications to surrounding landowners will be provided well in advance of any potential blasting.</p> <p>Today, the use of blasting is a very controlled and minimally impactful method to extract rock in many construction projects from single site development to linear projects such as pipelines. Current blasting techniques for pipeline construction use very carefully placed charges that are positioned in a manner to control the direction and velocity of the blast. Modeling is used to assess the pattern and distance of the blasting. Following construction a supplemental inspection will be conducted.</p>
FSL 24 - Hopewell Township; Delaware Township; USEPA	Climate Change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts from pipeline construction 	<p>Although there are currently no regulatory requirements in place (either at a federal or state level) that limit carbon dioxide emissions from a facility, proper combustion techniques combined with high efficiency equipment can minimize the production of carbon dioxide and the emissions of associated greenhouse gases (GHGs). In terms of direct methane leaks from the natural gas supply, routine maintenance and proper construction of the pipeline will substantially reduce fugitive emissions from the equipment. All construction and maintenance will be in accordance with pertinent state and federal regulations.</p> <p>A complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air quality in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project will be included in PennEast's environmental analysis as Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality.</p>
FSL 25 - Lehigh Valley Planning Commission; USEPA; Mercer County; US Fish and Wildlife; Delaware Township; Lower Saucon Township; Kaufer, A	Environmental Impact Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed and properly prepared environmental report will be completed • Additional Public Hearings 	<p>FERC intends to prepare an Environmental Report (ER) in accordance with FERC Order Nos. 603, et seq., which governs the filing of the ER portion of applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity, authorizing the construction and operation of facilities to provide service under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C §717f).</p>
FSL 26 - West Wyoming Borough; Bethlehem Township	Sewers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to infrastructure 	<p>See response to FSL 1</p>
FSL 27 - West Wyoming Borough; Delaware Township	Abandoned Mines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts to historic mining practices 	<p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, flash flooding, and location of abandoned mines. A complete analysis of the geology in the Project area will be presented in Resource Report 6 – Geology.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with the PADEP Bureau of Abandoned Mine Reclamation to examine the area where the pipeline would cross the Susquehanna River where abandoned mines are located.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
<p>FSL 28 - Delaware Township, Environmental Commission, EPA Region 3, Frenchtown Environmental Commission, Hopewell Township, Lower Saucon Township, Plains Township, Solebury Township Board of Supervisors</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in the Marcellus and Utica shale formations • Other pipeline projects proposed in the PennEast Project area • Existing pipeline crossings and facilities 	<p>A cumulative impact is “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.” 40 CFR § 1508.7. In evaluating cumulative impacts, the agency should consider: 1) the area in which the effects of the proposed project will be felt; 2) the impacts that are expected in that area from the proposed project; 3) other actions – past, present, and reasonably foreseeable – that have had or are expected to have impacts in the same area; 4) the impacts or expected impacts from these other actions; and 5) the overall impact that can be expected if the individual impacts are allowed to accumulate. <i>Grand Canyon Trust v. Fed. Aviation Admin.</i>, 290 F.3d 339, 345 (D.C. Cir. 2002); <i>San Juan Citizens Alliance v. Stiles</i>, 654 F.3d 1038, 1056 (10th Cir. 2011); <i>Gulf Restoration Network v. United States Dept. of Transportation</i>, 452 F.3d 362, 368 (5th Cir. 2006).</p> <p>The impacts of natural gas production are not generally considered by FERC in its assessment of pipeline projects and we expect that PennEast will be treated similarly. The impacts from the exploration, drilling, and processing of natural gas should not be considered because the timing of such development is uncertain, the activities are in different regions, involve different types of physical processes, and the production and processing of natural gas prior to shipment in a pipeline is regulated separately by federal, state, and any local regulations where the gas processing plant is located. For these reasons, FERC is not required to consider the effects of natural gas production in its NEPA analysis consistent with such treatment in recent FERC orders.</p> <p>PennEast will address the cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable projects that will impact the same areas as the PennEast Project in its Resource Reports, with the cumulative impacts discussed by resource in the applicable Resource Report. PennEast will update its cumulative impacts analysis in subsequent drafts of the report.</p>
<p>FSL 29 - County of Mercer; Hopewell Township Planning Board; Lower Saucon Township</p>	<p>Programmatic EIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “No Action” alternative • Other current or planned projects in the same area 	<p>The Council on Environmental Quality’s (CEQ) regulations state that major federal actions for which an EIS may be required include “programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; [and] systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18(b)(3) (2014). The Commission has no policy or plan or statutory program related to the “no action” alternative and other current and planned projects in the same area. Accordingly, the Commission is not required to conduct a programmatic EIS.</p>
<p>FSL 30 - Lower Saucon Township; New Jersey State Agriculture Development Committee; West Amwell Township Planning Board</p>	<p>Eminent Domain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right to use eminent domain on land protected by state law • Potential for abuse of the right of eminent domain 	<p>A certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by the Commission conveys a right of eminent domain in accordance with Section 7(h) of the Natural Gas Act. 15 U.S.C. § 717f(h) (2012). In deciding whether to grant a certificate, the Commission’s stated goal “is to appropriately consider the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain.” <i>Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities</i>, 88 FERC ¶ 61,227, at p. 61,746 (1999) (“Certificate Policy Statement”), <i>order clarifying Statement of Policy</i>, 90 FERC ¶ 61,128 (2000), <i>order further clarifying Statement of Policy</i>, 92 FERC ¶ 61,094 (2000). Further, the Commission’s standard environmental conditions require that the eminent domain authority must be consistent with the facilities and locations approved in the certificate order and that the right cannot be used for future needs or other purposes. Thus, the Commission protects landowners from the potential for abuse by limiting the right of eminent domain.</p>

Comment No. -Stakeholders	Issue of Concern	Found In/Status
FSL 31 - Lower Nazareth Township Board of Supervisors; West Wyoming Borough Council	Local Ordinances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project facilities' compliance with local ordinances. 	Consistent with Commission policy, PennEast will comply with all applicable state and local permits and requirements that are consistent with the Commission's certificate. However, "state and local agencies, through application of state or local laws, may [not] prohibit or unreasonably delay the construction or operation of facilities approved by this Commission." <i>Empire Pipeline, Inc., et al.</i> , 150 FERC ¶ 61,181 at PP 135 (2015) (citing <i>Schneidewind v. ANR Pipeline Co.</i> , 485 U.S. 293 (1988); <i>Nat'l Fuel Gas Supply v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n</i> , 894 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990); <i>Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P.</i> , 52 FERC ¶ 61,091 (1990) and 59 FERC ¶ 61,094 (1992)).

Belleman, Christopher J. "United States Federal Energy Regulatory Commission PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC - Docket No. 15-1-000 Wyoming Valley Flood Protection System." Letter to Kimberly D. Bose. 28 Jan. 2015. MS. N.p.

Diskin, Barry A., Jack P. Friedman, Spero C. Peppas, Stephanie R. Peppas. 2011. The Effect of Natural Gas Pipelines on Residential Value. International Right of Way Online Journal. Available at: http://www.irwaonline.org/eweb/upload/web_jan_NaturalGas.pdf.. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

Fruits, Eric. 2008. Natural Gas Pipelines and Residential Property Values: Evidence from Clackamas and Washington Counties. *ECONorthwest*. February 20, 2008.

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation (INGAA). 2001. Natural Gas Pipeline Impact Study. <http://www.ingaa.org/Foundation/Studies/FoundationReports/207.aspx>. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

15 U.S.C. §717f. 2015. Natural Gas Act of 1938. Section 7: Construction, extension, or abandonment of facilities. Available online at: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/chapter-15B>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

49 CFR §190-199. 2015. Pipeline Safety Regulations. Available online at: <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/SafetyStandards.htm>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

54 U.S.C. 306108. 2015. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). Section 106: Regulations. Available online at: <http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

Table 2: NGO/Other Comments January 13 – February 27, 2015

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 1- Fry's Run Watershed Association, Williams Township Concerned Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Fry's Run Watershed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands and areas of hydric soils • Colonization of cleared areas by invasive plant species • Sinkholes and structural integrity of pipeline • Compaction of agricultural soils by excavation equipment • Heat from pressurized pipeline gas 	<p>The proposed pipeline has been through numerous alternative assessments and route refinements to avoid or minimize direct impacts to wetland resources and associated hydric soils. Stream crossings for the pipeline will be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and reviewed and/or approved by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), conservation districts, River Basin Commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. PennEast will employ BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate the sensitive streams waterbodies and wetlands in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p> <p>The FERC Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures will be carefully adhered to with respect to segregation of soils and control measures for invasive species (FERC, 2013a). These measures will be supplemented with each state's BMPs for erosion and sediment control. These measures will be summarized in Resource Report 2 and associated Appendices, as well as applicable state and county permit applications.</p> <p>Extensive efforts are being made during the siting process to evaluate the possibility of sinkholes, caves, abandoned mines, and karst formations being encountered in the Project area. Geotechnical and geophysical studies of the Project area are ongoing and the results will be included in Resource Report 6 – Geological Resources. Specifically, Section 6.6 of Resource Report 6 will evaluate geologic hazards in the Project area.</p> <p>The high grade steel to be used to manufacture the pipeline will minimize sinkhole risks. Piping, such as that planned for the Project, can withstand loss of subgrade support of over 100 feet in length without being compromised. Should a sinkhole occur, PennEast would immediately address the situation by properly shoring the pipeline.</p> <p>The FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation and Maintenance Plan will be carefully adhered to with respect to agricultural soils, compaction and revegetation and will be summarized in Resource Report 7 and associated Appendices (FERC, 2013b).</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
---------------------------	------------------	------------------

NGO 2- Mercer County Open Space Preservation Board, Stony Brook Garden Club, D&R Greenway Land Trust, Delaware River Keeper, Lehigh Gap Nature Center, Holland Township: Citizens Against the Pipeline, Holland Township Agriculture Advisory Committee, Mercer County Freeholders, Williams Township Concerned Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline, Saucon Creek Watershed Association, Garden Club of Princeton, NJ Sierra Club, NJ Conservation Foundation, Washington Crossing Audubon Society; Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council

Preserved Lands

Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to preserved open space and other conserved properties. PennEast has co-located the construction right-of-way (ROW) adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to reduce fragmentation of preserved areas. A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.

PennEast is coordinating with relevant agencies, conservation groups and land owners to develop suitable measures to minimize disturbances to preserved open space and conserved lands, and to fairly compensate for potential impacts. Effects to preserved open space and conserved lands will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored to their original condition following construction activities in accordance with FERC restoration conditions and restoration plans approved by the relevant agencies.

Following construction of the pipeline, disturbed areas will be stabilized and reseeded in accordance with the seeding recommendations of the local Conservation District or land managing agency. Trees and other woody vegetation will be allowed to re-vegetate naturally within the temporary pipeline construction ROW and extra workspaces. Additionally, PennEast will implement restoration measures in accordance with its agency-approved E&S and Site Restoration Plan.

Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate vegetation and habitat resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.

Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will evaluate various land uses in the Project area including Natural, Recreational, and Scenic Areas and Public or Conservation Land.

Please see response to NGO 1

Effects to plant/wildlife habitat will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored with native vegetation in accordance with FERC restoration regulations, and USACE/NJDEP approved restoration plans. Timing restrictions on tree clearing are anticipated to be implemented as part of various federal/state permits to protect nesting migratory birds. Resource Reports 2 and 3 will provide details.

PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Prior to construction, PennEast will be required to submit detailed erosion and sediment control (E&S) plans to both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and/or county conservation districts. Upon approval, PennEast will employ related BMPs during construction to prevent erosion in accordance with the approved plans, as well as applicable regulations and permits. After

Sensitive Areas (Sourland Mountain Region)

- Habitats of native plants and animals,
- Erosion and loss of sediment filtration
- Drinking water wells
- Howell Living History Farm
- Popular trails throughout Baldpate, Pleasant Valley Historic District and Washington Crossing State Park
- Agricultural land parcels: 46.7 acres, Forest: 38.5 acres, Built-Up land parcels: 14.9 acres, Total: 105 acres disturbed
- 13 streams/tributaries: Jacobs Creek, Alexauken Creek, Woodsville Brook, Baldwins Creek, Peters Brook

NGO 3 - Stony Brook Garden Club, Sourland Conservancy, Sourland Planning and Management Project, Washington Crossing Audubon Society, Garden Club of Trenton, D&R Greenway Land Trust, Garden Club of Princeton, Washington Crossing Audubon Society

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
		<p>restoration, PennEast is responsible for maintaining the permanent ROW while the pipeline remains in operation. Federal and state regulatory agencies will inspect and monitor the area to maintain compliance with all regulations and permits.</p> <p>Construction plans for the Project will be permitted through the NPDES and reviewed and/or approved by the state DEP, conservation districts, and River Basin Commissions. PennEast will employ approved BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>PennEast's E&S and Site Restoration Plan will be included in its FERC application as Appendix E.</p> <p>PennEast met with Mercer County Park Commission and Mercer County Planning Department in January, 2015 to discuss ways in which the proposed alignment, construction, and operation of the pipeline could avoid or minimize impacts to existing park resources.</p> <p>The alignment avoids crossing operational facilities/structures of the Howell Living History Farm. Some nearby parcels used for environmental education programs will be disturbed; the alignment on these parcels is co-located with existing electric transmission lines.</p> <p>The proposed alignment does not cross parcels which are part of Washington Crossing State Park.</p> <p>Proposed disturbances to various land use/land cover types within the Project alignment are provided in Resource Report 8. Some disturbances will be temporary in nature; for example, disturbed agricultural lands will continue to serve as agricultural lands following construction.</p> <p>The Project alignment crosses numerous waterways both within, and outside of the Sourlands Region. These resources will be identified and quantified in Resource Report 2. All crossings are subject to FERC crossing requirements, USACE requirements under Section 10 of the Federal Rivers and Harbors Act, as well as permitting under the applicable PA and NJ State regulations.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 4 - New Jersey Conservation Foundation, Stony Brook Watershed Association, Delaware Township Citizens Against the Pipeline, D&R Greenway Land Trust, Berks Gas Truth, Bucks County Concerned Citizens Against the Pipeline, Carbon Pipeline Alliance, Chatham Citizens, Concerned Citizens Against the Pipeline Holland Township, Delaware Riverkeeper Network, Delaware Township Citizens Against the Pipeline, Durham Concerned Citizens Against the Pipeline, Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition, Hopewell Township Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline, Lehigh Valley Food & Water Watch, Moore Township Parents Against the Pipeline, NJ Sierra Club, Pennsylvanians Against the PennEast Pipeline, NJ Sierra Club, Pennsylvanians Against the PennEast Pipeline, Sourland Conservancy, StopPennEast.org, Towamensing Citizens Against the Pipeline, Williams Township Citizens Against the Pipeline, League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, NJ Sierra Club, Concerned Citizens Against the Pipeline</p>	<p>Extension of Scoping Period</p>	<p>The FERC has provided an extension and additional meeting to address weather conditions and concerns. The Commission accepted PennEast into the pre-filing process on October 10, 2014 and since that date the Commission Staff has accepted comments on the docket, including during the scoping period, and the Commission Staff will continue accepting comments throughout the pre-filing period. Stakeholders will have opportunities to file further comments following PennEast's filing of the formal certificate application, including comments following the issuance of the draft EIS.</p>
<p>NGO 5- Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation</p>	<p>Abandoned mines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic mining practices 	<p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, flash flooding, and location of abandoned mines. A complete analysis of the geology in the Project area will be presented in Resource Report 6 – Geology.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with the PADEP Bureau of Abandoned Mine Reclamation to examine the area where the pipeline would cross the Susquehanna River where abandoned mines are located.</p>
<p>NGO 6 - Cooks Creek Watershed Association</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Cooks Creek Watershed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of vegetation • Application of pesticides • Crossing of the headwaters of the watershed • Erosion • Limestone geology • Invasive plants • Habitat fragmentation, • Native brook trout fisheries • Open Space program and prime agricultural soils • Drinking water wells 	<p>Please see responses to NGO 1, 2, 3.</p> <p>No pesticides will be used in the maintenance of the pipeline ROW.</p> <p>It has been proposed that trout streams be crossed using bores and other dry construction techniques to avoid or minimize potential adverse impacts to fishery resources.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 7 - Aquashicola/Pohopoco Watershed Conservancy</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Aquashicola and Pohopoco Watersheds)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bog Turtles habitat • EV status wetlands • Forest and habitat fragmentation • Chemical herbicides • Invasion of non-native species • Decrease in property values 	<p>Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 6.</p> <p>Consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state agencies are currently ongoing regarding rare, threatened and endangered species (including protected birds, reptiles, and mammals), associated habitats and protocols for field surveys. Potential habitats have been mapped from federal and state databases. Where practicable, the pipeline route is being adjusted to avoid protected habitats. Preliminary field surveys are being conducted where access permission has been granted. If it is determined that the pipeline route cannot be adjusted to avoid areas of concern, other avoidance and mitigation measures will be evaluated, such as construction using bores and HDD, timing restrictions and other previously approved techniques and will be addressed through the environmental permitting and FERC EIS processes.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate the threatened and endangered species in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p> <p>There are millions of miles of pipelines throughout the country and, thus, there are a considerable number of properties near pipelines. A report by Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc., which was prepared in 2001 for the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, Inc., evaluated the impact of natural gas pipelines on real estate in four separate and geographically diverse areas, including two suburban areas and two rural areas crossed by one to multiple natural gas pipelines. The study concluded that there was no significant impact on property sales located along natural gas pipelines due to the pipeline size or the product carried. Additionally, other studies have reached similar conclusions: PGP Valuation Inc. (2008) for Palomar Gas Transmission Inc.; Ecowest (Fruits, 2008) for the Oregon LNG Project; Diskin, Friedman, Peppas, and Peppas (2011); and Hansen et al. (2006).</p> <p>PennEast will compensate landowners fairly given readily available data on local property values and considering the potential use of the affected areas. An early and ongoing dialogue with property owners will allow PennEast to route the pipeline in mutually acceptable areas where practicable to minimize impacts to properties. This process has been successfully employed for decades.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
NGO 8 - NJ Sierra Club	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species	Please see response to NGO 7
NGO 9 - Sierra Club, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future, Appalachian Trail Conservancy, Trout Unlimited, Clean Air Council, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, Delaware River Keeper, Stony Brook Watershed Association, Clean Air Council, West Amwell Township Pipeline Committee, Alleghany Defense Project, Mercer County Freeholders, NJ Conservation Foundation	Properly prepared EIS	FERC is managing the preparation of a Third-Party EIS in accordance with applicable federal regulations and requirements.
NGO 10 - Delaware River Keeper	Construction (HDD): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sediments and contaminants from historic paper mills adjoining the Musconetcong River in New Jersey to be re-suspended Bioaccumulation of flora and fauna in surrounding environment 	Please see response to NGO 1
NGO 11 - Delaware River Keeper	Construction (Liability): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PennEast intersection with The Tuscarora Oil Co. Pipeline in the area of the Delaware River. Will PennEast have joint and several liability for any related clean up? 	<p>PennEast will work with each pipeline company being crossed to locate their pipeline. The required clearance and proper method of crossing will be in place to keep the existing pipeline in service.</p> <p>In the Delaware River area and along the entire pipeline, PennEast will construct using approved BMPs and approved Erosion and Sediment Control plans.</p>
NGO 12 - Delaware River Keeper	Construction (Corrosion): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrosion due to trace levels of chemical constituents used in the drilling/fracking process 	<p>Gas entering the PennEast pipeline will be monitored for gas quality to ensure compliance PennEast's with tariff gas quality specifications, which will be designed to limit receipt of gas that could cause erosion. Additionally, the PennEast pipeline is expected to transport dry, transmission-quality, natural gas.</p> <p>The design of the PennEast pipeline will include various measures to prevent corrosion. In addition, PennEast will meet or exceed all applicable safety regulations to include inspection requirements to ensure the safe and reliable operation of the pipeline.</p> <p>The pipeline is being designed so that it can utilize state-of-the art electronic inspection tools called "smart pigs". This will inspect the entire pipeline on a regular basis for anomalies.</p>
NGO 13 - Friends of Hopewell Valley Open Space, Washington Crossing Audubon Society	Watershed Impacts (Baldpate Mountain): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ted Stiles Preserve Bird Habitat RTE Species Blasting Fault Lines Trout Waters Pleasant Valley Historic District Curlis Lake Woods, part of the Mercer Meadows Preserve 	<p>The State of New Jersey and Mercer County which own the 3 affected parcels have been contacted about the Preserve and the overall Project a number of times. There are ongoing meetings planned in March, 2015.</p> <p>Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 5, 6, 7</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
NGO 14 - Delaware River Keeper, Lehigh Gap Nature Center	Purpose and Need for the Project	Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.
NGO 15 -. Appalachian Mountain Club, Appalachian Trail Conservancy, Delaware River Keeper	Appalachian Trail	The proposed crossing of the Appalachian Trail has been realigned to avoid federal lands and sensitive habitats.
NGO 16 - Appalachian Mountain Club, Delaware River Keeper, Clean Air Council, Garden Club of Princeton, NJ Sierra Club; Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council	Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methane • Ethane • Benzene • Toluene • Xylene • Carbon monoxide and ozone from the compressor station • Diesel emission from the construction vehicles 	<p>All potential impacts to air quality will be evaluated in accordance with PADEP and FERC regulatory requirements. Any emitting equipment used at the compressor station will meet or exceed PADEP Best Available Technology emissions standards and guidelines. Impacts will adhere to all applicable state and federal regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Although there are currently no regulatory requirements in place (either at a federal or state level) that limit carbon dioxide emissions from a facility, proper combustion techniques combined with high efficiency equipment can minimize the production of carbon dioxide and the emissions of associated greenhouse gases (GHGs). In terms of direct methane leaks from the natural gas supply, routine maintenance and proper construction of the pipeline will substantially reduce fugitive emissions from the equipment. All construction and maintenance will be in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations.</p> <p>Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality will provide a complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air quality in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project.</p> <p>Please see Attached Table at end of document.</p>
NGO 17 - Appalachian Mountain Club, Delaware River Keeper, Stony Brook Watershed Association, Clean Air Council, Holland Township: Citizens Against the Pipeline, Garden Club of Princeton, Frenchtown Environmental Commission, NJ Conservation Foundation	Climate Change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouses gases • Increased precipitation • Flooding • Scouring • Erosion 	<p>Please see response to NGO 1 and 3</p> <p>Although there are currently no regulatory requirements in place (either at a federal or state level) that limit carbon dioxide emissions from a facility, proper combustion techniques combined with high efficiency equipment can minimize the production of carbon dioxide and the emissions of associated GHGs. In terms of direct methane leaks from the natural gas supply, routine maintenance and proper construction of the pipeline will substantially reduce fugitive emissions from the equipment. All construction and maintenance will be in accordance with pertinent state and federal regulations.</p> <p>A complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air quality in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project will be included in PennEast's environmental analysis as Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
---------------------------	------------------	------------------

NGO 18 - Holland Township: Citizens Against the Pipeline, Williams Township Concerned Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline, NJ Conservation Foundation; Hickory Run Forest Land and Homeowners Association

Socioeconomics

- Decreasing property values
- Failing to provide source of jobs for local residents
- Decrease in farmland

Please see response to NGO 1

There are millions of miles of pipelines throughout the country and, thus, there are a considerable number of properties near pipelines. A report by Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc., which was prepared in 2001 for the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, Inc., evaluated the impact of natural gas pipelines on real estate in four separate and geographically diverse areas, including two suburban areas and two rural areas crossed by one to multiple natural gas pipelines. The study concluded that there was no significant impact on property sales located along natural gas pipelines due to the pipeline size or the product carried. Additionally, other studies have reached similar conclusions: PGP Valuation Inc. (2008) for Palomar Gas Transmission Inc.; Ecowest (Fruits, 2008) for the Oregon LNG Project; Diskin, Friedman, Peppas, and Peppas (2011); and Hansen et al. (2006).

According to an Economic Impact Analysis prepared by Econsult Solutions and Drexel University School of Economics, the Project will have a substantial positive economic impact on Pennsylvania and New Jersey residents, commercial businesses, industrial production plants and power generation. The benefits include 12,160 supported jobs with a labor income of \$740 million during the construction of the Project and 98 supported jobs with a labor income of \$8.3 million throughout the ongoing operations (Econsult Solutions and Drexel University, 2015).

On any pipeline ROW, proper restoration is required and monitored throughout the FERC process. After construction, the ROW will be regraded, seeded, and temporary erosion control devices will be installed, according to laws, regulations and approved BMPs. As a BMP for farming, when the ROW is prepared for construction, any topsoil that is present is carefully stripped off the top and stockpiled on the edge of the ROW, separate from any excavated subsoil. Once pipeline construction is completed, the topsoil will be returned to the ROW and restored to the original grade. Farming activities can resume as they did before construction and yields should not be materially affected in the long term.

PennEast will work with farmers to measure both pre- and post-construction crop yields until such time as yields have reached pre-construction levels. PennEast will compensate farmers for impacts to crop yields caused by the Project and will work diligently to eliminate the impact. Agricultural lands will be restored using approved, modern mitigation techniques designed to reestablish pre-existing productive use of the agricultural lands, which is typically within 3 years following Project completion.

PennEast will employ third party environmental inspectors to monitor all construction and restoration activities to maintain compliance with all E&S plans, FERC Order conditions, other

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 19 - Hunterdon Land Trust, Holland Township; Citizens Against the Pipeline, Williams Township Concerned Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline, Delaware Township Citizens Against the Pipeline, Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition; Hickory Run Forest Land and Homeowners Association</p>	<p>Health and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthquakes • Arsenic • Construction of pipeline near high voltage power lines 	<p>environmental permits and approvals and environmental requirements in landowner agreements.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p> <p>Standard safety practices for installation of a pipeline near a power line will be utilized during construction to ensure safety of all personnel. These safety measures include such things as training and daily safety “tailgate” discussions, static straps on vehicles, grounding of pipe strung along the ROW, utilization of safety spotters, etc.</p> <p>In addition to safety during construction, a detailed engineering review will be conducted to design mitigation measures in areas where the pipeline and power lines cross and/or parallel to alleviate static buildup on the pipeline. The installation of these AC mitigation measures is commonly used by all pipeline operators to ensure the safe operation of pipelines that are in close proximity to electric transmission facilities.</p> <p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, and flash flooding.</p> <p>The high grade steel to be used to manufacture the pipeline will minimize sinkhole risks. Piping, such as that planned for the Project, can withstand loss of subgrade support of over 100 feet in length without being compromised. Should a sinkhole occur, PennEast will immediately address the situation by properly shoring the pipeline.</p> <p>PennEast has conducted a Seismic Hazard Analysis for the pipeline, including along the Ramapo fault zone in New Jersey. Initial results of the analysis found that the probability of surface fault hazard to the pipeline was deemed well below the probabilities considered for engineering design and therefore insignificant.</p> <p>Resource Report 6 – Geology will include a complete analysis of the geology in the Project area.</p>
<p>NGO 20 - Delaware River Keeper</p>	<p>End Use of Gas</p>	<p>Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 21 - Delaware River Keeper; Hickory Run Forest Land and Homeowners Association</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Delaware River Watershed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Resources • Wetlands • Floodplains • Vegetated buffers • Fisheries • Vegetated habitats • Wildlife • RTE species • Invasive species • Landscape connectivity • Geology and soils • Viewsheds • Permanent soil compaction • Extreme thermal impacts, • Erosion • Nishisakawick and Little Nishisakawick C-1 streams are crossed 	<p>Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 6, 7</p>
<p>NGO 22 - Delaware River Keeper, Snow Ridge Community Trust, Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council</p>	<p>Potential Noise Impacts.</p>	<p>Noise impacts associated with the Project will be limited so that the Project will meet all applicable regulatory requirements. A complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to noise in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project will be included in PennEast's environmental analysis as Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality.</p>
<p>NGO 23 - Delaware River Keeper</p>	<p>Exposed Pipelines and Associated Risk of Rupture</p>	<p>PennEast will comply with the pipeline safety standards established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) (49 CFR §190-199). Pipelines are the safest, most environmentally-friendly and efficient mode of transporting energy, according to PHMSA. Data shows that while natural gas demand has increased, serious pipeline incidents have decreased by 90 percent over the past three decades alone, primarily as a result of significant efforts by pipeline companies to upgrade and modernize their infrastructure. Transportation by pipeline is the safest mode of transportation.</p> <p>Safety is PennEast's highest priority when designing pipelines. PennEast adopts design features and operating practices that meet or exceed stringent industry and regulatory standards. PennEast will regularly walk the PennEast Pipeline, conduct leak surveys and send sensor equipment through the line to make sure integrity has not been compromised. PennEast will continuously monitor (24/7/365) how much gas is transported through the system, operating pressures and temperatures throughout the system, and other critical operating data. This is done in real-time through our gas control center. Should any unusual data surface, PennEast will immediately dispatch field personnel to address the issue and protect the community. Additionally, the pipeline will be clearly marked at all road crossings, creeks, property lines, and fence lines</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
		<p>to minimize the potential for third-party damage. PennEast will be a member of the national 1-Call system (Dial 811) that requires anyone performing excavations to call 3 days prior so that the line can be located and marked in the area of the excavation.</p> <p>PennEast is designing the Project to exceed federal safety regulations in many important areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pipe material will meet and generally exceed the API-5L requirements; • Class 2 pipe will be installed in all Class 1 locations in order to increase safety factor; • 100 percent nondestructive inspection of mainline welds (for example 49 CFR 192 requires only 10 percent of the welds to be tested in Class 1 locations); and • Prior to placing the line into service, the pipe will be hydrostatically tested at a maximum pressure that will exceed industry standards identified in 49 CFR 192. <p>Community services will be properly prepared for emergencies that may arise due to the Project. Local emergency response and management personnel will receive emergency response training prior to the Project being placed into service and on an ongoing basis thereafter. Necessary information and instructions regarding the facilities will be provided to local emergency response and management personnel. A plan will be in place for coordination between PennEast and local emergency response and management personnel in the event of an incident. The operations of the community services in the Project area are unlikely to be negatively impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Resource Report 11 – Reliability and Safety will evaluate the overall safety of the Project through construction and pipeline operation and presents the extensive safety measures, emergency procedures, and oversight that will be adopted and implemented for the Project.</p>
<p>NGO 24 - Delaware River Keeper</p>	<p>Potential Impacts to recreation, aesthetics, art and the resulting economics</p>	<p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation and Aesthetics will evaluate the impacts on these elements in the affected area.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 - Socioeconomics will evaluate the economic impact of the Project in the affected area.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 25 - Delaware River Keeper</p>	<p>Potential Impacts to infrastructure, access and circulation.</p>	<p>PennEast will work with each utility company being crossed to locate, mark, and expose their facilities. The required clearance and proper method of crossings will be employed to keep the existing facilities in service throughout construction and prevent damage to existing infrastructure.</p> <p>During construction, access to the pipeline will be at road crossings and other points where longer distances between roads or physical features prevent construction traffic from traversing the pipeline ROW. In all cases, trained construction personnel will comply with all federal, state, and local regulations regarding traffic control measures and safety protocols.</p> <p>Road permits will be obtained where the pipeline crosses the road. Where possible, paved road crossings will be bored crossings allowing normal traffic flow.</p> <p>Mitigation measures will be implemented during construction in order to maintain the water circulation within wetlands and water bodies. Trench plugs will be placed in the pipeline trench at each side of water body crossings to maintain flow in the channel and not allow it to divert along the pipeline. In addition trench plugs and other design measures will also be used at wetland crossings to maintain the hydrology.</p>
<p>NGO 26 - Stony Book Watershed Association</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Stony Brook Watershed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rivers • Wetlands • Hakhokake Creek • Nishisakawick Creek • Little Nishisakawick Creek • Lockatong Creek • Wickecheoke Creek • Alexauken Creek, and Stony Creek • RTE Species • Preserved Open Space and Farmland • Historic and Cultural Resources 	<p>Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 6, 7</p> <p>In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, PennEast will identify cultural resources within the Project's area of potential effect (APE) and make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places to FERC and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (54 U.S.C. 306108). PennEast is making extensive efforts to avoid cultural resources during the siting process.</p> <p>PennEast has contacted members of fifteen federally recognized Native American tribes to determine concerns with the Project. A number of tribes have responded with determinations of 'No Effect' from the proposed project.</p> <p>Section 4.5 of Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources will present the results of cultural resource investigations in the Project's APE and provides avoidance or mitigation measures adopted by the Project.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 27 - Delaware River Keeper, NJ Sierra Club</p>	<p>Watershed Impacts (Delaware River Watershed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water resources • Wetlands • Floodplains • Vegetated buffers • Fisheries • Wildlife habitat • RTE species • Invasive species • Landscape connectivity • Geology • Soils • Viewsheds 	<p>Please see response to NGO 1, 3, 6, 7</p>
<p>NGO 28 - Delaware Township Citizens Against the Pipeline</p>	<p>Potential Impacts to Delaware Township</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watershed • Local Economy • Preserved Land 	<p>Please see response to NGO 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 18</p>
<p>NGO 29 - Princeton Hydro, Garden Club of Princeton, Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council, New Jersey Sierra Club, NJ Conservation Foundation, Washington Crossing Audubon Society); Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council</p>	<p>Potential Water Quality Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streams • Wetlands • Wildlife • Jacobs Creek • Alexauken Creek • Woodsville Brook • Stony Brook • Peters Brook • Francis. E Walter Dam • Lehigh River • Mosey Wood Wetland • Hickory Run State Park • Lake Harmony/Big Boulder Lake Natural areas • Mud Run Natural area • Swan Creek Reservoir 	<p>Please see response to NGO 1</p>
<p>NGO 30 - Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council, NJ Sierra Club</p>	<p>Tourism</p>	<p>Tourism is significant contributor to the economies within the Project area. The effects on outdoor recreation areas, a main tourist attraction throughout the Project area, will be minimized through co-location and agency coordination, lessening the overall impact of the Project on tourism.</p> <p>In addition, PennEast will work closely with county and state officials to incorporate passive and active recreational features as appropriate along the ROW on public lands.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
NGO 31 - Lehigh Gap Nature Center	ROW Maintenance Procedures	Please see response to NGO 1
NGO 32 - Lehigh Gap Nature Center	Potential Impacts to Kittatinny Ridge.	Please see response to NGO 1
NGO 33 - Holland Township: Citizens Against the Pipeline	Karst Topography	Please see response to NGO 1
NGO 34 - Saucon Creek Watershed Association	Watershed Impacts (Saucon Creek Watershed)	Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 6, 7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream banks • Drainage Patterns • Erosion • Soil Compaction • Degradation of water quality 	
NGO 35 - Saucon Creek Watershed Association, Kidder Township Environmental Advisory Council	Groundwater Impacts:	Please see response to NGO 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking water wells • Water resources • Septic Tanks 	
NGO 36 - Northampton Area School District	Socioeconomics	Socio-economic concerns will be addressed in Resource Report 5. These two facilities are greater than 0.5 miles from the proposed Project corridor.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns with routing of pipeline in close proximity to George Wolf Elementary School • St. John's Lutheran Church 	
NGO 37 - Durham Historical Society, NJ Sierra Club; Hickory Run Forest Land and Homeowners Association	Historic Areas	Please see response to NGO 26
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durham/Cooks Creek Heritage Area 	
NGO 38 - NJ Conservation Foundation	Potential Air Impacts	Please see response to NGO 1,6
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon Sequestration 	
NGO 39 - NJ Conservation Foundation	Potential Watershed Impacts (Wickechoke Preserve)	Please see responses to NGO 1, 3, 6, 7

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 40 - Delaware Township, Environmental Commission, EPA Region 3, Frenchtown Environmental Commission, Hopewell Township, Lower Saucon Township, Plains Township, Solebury Township Board of Supervisors, Delaware Riverkeeper Network, Hunterdon Land Trust, Appalachian Mountain Club, Appalachian Trail Conservancy, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future, Clean Air Council, Sierra Club New Jersey Chapter, Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in the Marcellus and Utica shale formations • Other pipeline projects proposed in the PennEast Project area • Existing pipeline crossings and facilities • Later expansions of, and upgrades to, the PennEast pipeline • Later continued disturbance from routes that are co-located with the PennEast pipeline 	<p>The impacts of natural gas production are not generally considered by FERC in its assessment of pipeline projects and we expect that PennEast will be treated similarly. The impacts from the exploration, drilling, and processing of natural gas should not be considered because the timing of such development is uncertain, the activities are in different regions, involve different types of physical processes, and the production and processing of natural gas prior to shipment in a pipeline is regulated separately by federal, state, and any local regulations where the gas processing plant is located. For these reasons, FERC is not required to consider the effects of natural gas production in its NEPA analysis consistent with such treatment in recent FERC orders.</p> <p>PennEast will address the cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable projects that will impact the same areas as the PennEast Project in its Resource Reports, with the cumulative impacts discussed by resource in the applicable Resource Report. PennEast will update its cumulative impacts analysis in subsequent drafts of the report.</p> <p>The FEIS is not required to consider cumulative impacts from later expansions of, and upgrades to, the PennEast pipeline, and later continued disturbance from routes that are co-located with the PennEast pipeline because neither of those actions is reasonably foreseeable</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 41 - Allegheny Defense Project, Clean Air Council</p>	<p>Connected Actions, Cumulative Actions and Similar Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaffiliated interstate pipelines 	<p>“Connected actions” are defined as those that (i) automatically trigger other actions, (ii) cannot proceed unless other actions are undertaken previously or simultaneously, or (iii) are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification. 40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a). Given that the PennEast Project does not cause any of the other pipeline projects, will proceed irrespective of whether those other actions are undertaken and is not interdependent with any other pipeline project, FERC is not required to consider those other pipeline projects as connected actions.</p> <p>Cumulative actions are those actions that, “when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts” that should be discussed in the same EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25(a)(2). As discussed above, the Commission will consider the cumulative impacts from the reasonably foreseeable projects in the same area as the PennEast Project in the Environmental Impact Statement for the PennEast Project. As such, the PennEast EIS will address whether any reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts are potentially significant.</p> <p>The Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) regulations define “similar actions” as actions “which when viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequences together, such as common timing or geography.” 40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(3). Even if it were determined that the PennEast Project and any of the other projects are similar actions under NEPA, CEQ regulations are clear that “[a]n agency may wish to analyze [similar] actions in the same impact statement. It should do so when the best way to access adequately the combined impacts of similar actions or reasonable alternatives to such actions is to treat them in a single impact statement.” Thus, the regulations provide agencies with discretion whether to analyze “similar actions” in the same NEPA document. Given the differing purposes and needs for these projects, and the disparity in time and geography or impacts, it is reasonable for the Commission to determine that a single review is not the best way to assess the PennEast Project and the other projects.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>NGO 42 - Allegheny Defense Project, County of Mercer, Hopewell Township Planning Board, Lower Saucon Township, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association</p>	<p>Programmatic EIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas projects related to the Marcellus and Utica formations • “No Action” alternative • Other current or planned projects in the same area 	<p>The Council on Environmental Quality’s (CEQ) regulations state that major federal actions for which an EIS may be required include “programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; [and] systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18(b)(3) (2014). The Commission has determined that a programmatic EIS is not required for shale development because, among other reasons, “there is no Commission plan or policy to promote the unconventional production of, or increase reliance on, natural gas.” <i>Empire Pipeline, Inc., et al.</i>, 150 FERC ¶ 61,181 at PP 93-96 (2015) (“<i>Empire</i>”) (citing <i>Texas Eastern Transmission, LP (Texas Eastern)</i>, 149 FERC ¶ 61,259 (2014), <i>Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC</i>, 149 FERC ¶ 61,255 (2014), <i>Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.</i>, 150 FERC ¶ 61,160 (2015), <i>Rockies Express Pipeline LLC</i>, 150 FERC ¶ 61,161 (2015)). The Commission has no policy or plan or statutory program related to the “no action” alternative and other current and planned projects in the same area. Accordingly, the Commission is not required to conduct a programmatic EIS.</p>
<p>NGO 43 - Delaware Riverkeeper Network, D&R Greenway Land Trust, Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition, Lehigh Gap Nature Center, Lower Saucon Township, New Jersey Conservation Foundation, New Jersey State Agriculture Development Committee, West Amwell Township Planning Board</p>	<p>Eminent Domain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right to use eminent domain on land protected by state law • Potential for abuse of the right of eminent domain • The appropriate compensation in condemnation proceedings 	<p>A certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by the Commission conveys a right of eminent domain in accordance with Section 7(h) of the Natural Gas Act. 15 U.S.C. § 717f(h) (2012). In deciding whether to grant a certificate, the Commission’s stated goal “is to appropriately consider the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain.” <i>Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities</i>, 88 FERC 61,227, at p. 61,746 (1999) (“Certificate Policy Statement”), <i>order clarifying Statement of Policy</i>, 90 FERC 61,128 (2000), <i>order further clarifying Statement of Policy</i>, 92 FERC 61,094 (2000). Further, the Commission’s standard environmental conditions require that the eminent domain authority must be consistent with the facilities and locations approved in the certificate order and that the right cannot be used for future needs or other purposes. Thus, the Commission protects landowners from the potential for abuse by limiting the right of eminent domain.</p> <p>Although the Commission’s authorization conveys a right of eminent domain, the Commission does not oversee the exercise of such right. In order to exercise its right, a pipeline must bring a condemnation proceeding in state or federal court. State law governs just compensation for easement interests that are acquired through eminent domain when ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction. Thus, the EIS is not required to address the appropriate compensation in a condemnation proceeding.</p>

Comment No. - Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
---------------------------	------------------	------------------

NGO 44 - Lower Nazareth Township Board of Supervisors; West Wyoming Borough Council

Local Ordinances

- Project facilities' compliance with local ordinances.

Consistent with Commission policy, PennEast will comply with all applicable state and local permits and requirements that are consistent with the Commission's certificate. However, "state and local agencies, through application of state or local laws, may [not] prohibit or unreasonably delay the construction or operation of facilities approved by this Commission." *Empire Pipeline, Inc., et al.*, 150 FERC 61,181 at PP 135 (2015) (citing *Schneidewind v. ANR Pipeline Co.*, 485 U.S. 293 (1988); *Nat'l Fuel Gas Supply v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 894 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990); *Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P.*, 52 FERC 61,091 (1990) and 59 FERC 61,094 (1992)).

*** NGO Response 16 -Air Quality Table**

Pollutant	Pipeline	Compressor Station
Methane,	Not emitted, unless through leaks of above ground components (Valves, flanges, etc.) However, pipeline design and operations both focus on minimizing and control these fugitive emissions. Methane is not a regulated air pollutant except that it is considered a Greenhouse Gas.	Traces of methane can be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not a regulated pollutant because it is not considered a VOC.
ethane,	Not emitted, unless through leaks of above ground components (Valves, flanges, etc.) However, pipeline design and operations both focus on minimizing and control these fugitive emissions. Ethan is not regulated as a VOC.	Traces of ethane can be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not a regulated pollutant because it is not considered a VOC.
benzene,	Not a significant component of Pipeline Quality Natural Gas	Traces of benzene can be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not expected to be emitted at emission rates that would trigger additional requirements or evaluation other than estimating the trace amounts.
toluene,	Not a significant component of Pipeline Quality Natural Gas	Traces of toluene can be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not expected to be emitted at emission rates that would trigger additional requirements or evaluation other than estimating the trace amounts.
xylene,	Not a significant component of Pipeline Quality Natural Gas	Traces of xylene can be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not expected to be emitted at emission rates that would trigger additional requirements or evaluation other than estimating the trace amounts.
carbon monoxide	Not a significant component of Pipeline Quality Natural Gas	Carbon Monoxide is expected to be emitted as a result of incomplete combustion, however it is not expected to be emitted at emission rates that would trigger additional requirements or evaluation other than estimating the emission amounts. The PADEP Plan Approval Process will assure the emissions and emission rates and emission controls meet the applicable

		requirements.
ozone	Not a component of Pipeline Quality Natural Gas.	Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides will be emitted from combustion sources. Both of these pollutants are precursors to Ozone. The PADEP Plan Approval Process will assure the emissions and emission rates and emission controls meet the applicable requirements.

Diskin, Barry A., Jack P. Friedman, Spero C. Peppas, Stephanie R. Peppas. 2011. The Effect of Natural Gas Pipelines on Residential Value. International Right of Way Online Journal. Available at: http://www.irwaonline.org/eweb/upload/web_jan_NaturalGas.pdf.. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

Fruits, Eric. 2008. Natural Gas Pipelines and Residential Property Values: Evidence from Clackamas and Washington Counties. *ECONorthwest*. February 20, 2008.

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation (INGAA). 2001. Natural Gas Pipeline Impact Study. <http://www.ingaa.org/Foundation/Studies/FoundationReports/207.aspx>. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

54 U.S.C. 306108. 2015. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). Section 106: Regulations. Available online at: <http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 2013a. Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures. Available online at: <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/gas/enviro/procedures.pdf>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 2013b. Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan. 2013b. Available online at: <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/gas/enviro/plan.pdf>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

Table 3: Landowner Comments January 13 – February 27, 2015

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 1 - Bydalek, M.; Carrick, G.; DeGrado, V.; DiBianca, V.; Feary, V.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Fleischman, O.; Griffith, J.; Hanson, A.; Johnson, S.; Kager Family; Kenny, T.; Kohler, E.; Lamson, J.; Leap, G.; Markus, W.; Matybell, B.; McAdam, J.; Rushatz, R.; Salata, G.; Smith, N.; Soloman, N.; Sommo, T.; Switzler, E.; Tucci, E.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Weber, C.; Wissig, M.; Baker, C.; Bernet, G.; Buschmann, C.; Cook, L.; Culver, B.; Dibianca, V.; Kuenstner, C.; Lick, J.; Lick, T.; Matyas, J.; Matyas, R.; Onstott, T.; Orrichio, A.; Paulus, W.; Peterman, B.; Rader, R.; Runkle, R.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Spolar, W.; Toth, R.; Wagner, G.; Merkel, B.; Seier, S.; Weber, C.; Connor, D.</p>	<p>Groundwater Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drinking water wells • Groundwater resources • Septic tanks 	<p>PennEast is using a critical issues assessment process to identify sensitive resource areas, and then work with engineering to avoid or minimize potential impacts. In combination with the use of BMPs, these efforts will maintain designated groundwater quality within the Project area.</p> <p>During construction, equipment is inspected on a daily basis for integrity. Fueling activities will be restricted as specified in a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. In the unlikely event of a leak or breach in the pipeline, the natural gas would rise to the ground surface and dissipate in the air. There are no liquids in the pipeline that would be released to the groundwater.</p> <p>The Project will not impact groundwater recharge ability, groundwater sources, or impede flow rate.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate existing groundwater resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>LO 2 - King, D.</p>	<p>Floodplains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route 523 flooding in Stockton, NJ 	<p>Waterbody and floodplain crossings for the pipeline will be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and reviewed or approved by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), County Conservation Districts, River Basin Commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. PennEast will employ BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 3 - Buchanan, T.; Bydalek, M.; Feary, V.; Fleischman, O.; Foglio, C.; Gorelli, J.; Griffith, J.; Hanson, A.; Heindel, L.; Kager Family; Kelly, E.; Kenny, B.; Kenny, T.; King, D.; Kohler, A.; Kohler, R.; Lamson, J.; Mackey, C.; Matybell, B.; McAdam, J.; Onstott, T.; Runkle, C.; Runkle, K.; Salata, G.; Sauer, L.; Seier, C.; Seier, F.; Smith, N.; Sommo, T.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Weber, C.; Wissig, M.; Andrejko, J.; Apffel Jr, J.; Baker, C.; Bernet, G.; Buschmann, C.; Cook, L.; Dibianca, V.; Lick, J.; Lick, T.; Lilly, A.; Lilly, D.; Matyas, J.; Matyas, R.; Paulus, J.; Paulus, W.; Peterman, B.; Rader, R.; Runkle, R.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Spolar, W.; Swiatek, J.; Swiatek, R.; Wagner, G.; Heindel, N.; Lick, J.; Metz, J.; Mineo, L.; Seier, R.; Seier, S.; Smith, C.; Smith, L.; Smith, N.; Smith, V.; Wilson, N.; Bubbenmoyer, S.; Bubbenmoyer, K.; Connor, D.</p>	<p>Surface Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lockatong Creek • Alexauken Creek • Wickecheoke Creek • Baldwins Creek • Baldwins Lake • Stony Brook • Fry Run • Delaware River • Drainage Patterns • Wetlands 	<p>PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Additionally, it is planned that dry crossing techniques, such as dam flume pipes and dam and pump, bores and horizontal directional drill (HDD) will be used to cross many waterbodies. The use of these BMPs will maintain the designated water quality, and there should be no impact to water quality downstream of any of these features. PennEast plans to construct and restore these areas in accordance with the rules and regulations of various regulatory agencies and will maintain compliance with these requirements through environmental inspection during the construction and restoration time period.</p> <p>Stream and wetland crossings for the pipeline will be permitted through the NPDES and Wetland Programs, and reviewed or approved by the state DEP, County Conservation Districts, River Basin Commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. PennEast will employ BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>Erosion and loss of sediment filtration/increased runoff will be avoided through the implementation of approved Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plans. The Project is also subject to FERC and PA/NJ Stormwater regulations, and will implement the required practices to address water quality, quantity, and groundwater recharge.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate existing surface water and wetland resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>
<p>LO 4 - Briede, D.; Bydalek, M.; Fisher, C.; Kager Family; Lamson, J.; Matybel I, B.; Rader, S.; Smith, N.; Soloman, N.; Sommo, T.; Switzler, E.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Bernet, G.; Bubbenmoyer, K.; Bubbenmoyer, S.; Buschmann, C.; Peterman, B.; Rader, R.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Seier, R.; Seier, S.; Smith, C.; Smith, L.; Smith, V.</p>	<p>Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species and Habitats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bird Species • Bog Turtle Habitat • Vernal Habitats • Bald Eagle Habitat 	<p>Consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state agencies are currently ongoing relative to rare, threatened and endangered species (including protected birds, reptiles, and mammals), associated habitats and protocols for field surveys. Potential habitats have been mapped from federal and state databases. Where practicable, the pipeline route is being adjusted to avoid protected habitats. Preliminary field surveys are being conducted where access permission has been granted. If it is determined that the pipeline route cannot be adjusted to avoid areas of concern, other avoidance and mitigation measures will be evaluated, such as, construction using bores and HDD, timing restrictions and other previously approved techniques and will be addressed through the environmental permitting and FERC Environmental Impact Statement process.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate the threatened and endangered species in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 5 - Anthony, A.; Buchanan, T.; DiBianca, V.; Fisher, C.; Foglio, C.; Gorelli, J.; Griffith, D.; Griffith, E.; Hanson, A.; Karcher, C.; Kelly, E.; Kohler, A.; Moore, J.; Moore, W.; Rader, S.; Richard, A.; Runkle, K.; Sayles, C.; Slata, G.; Switzler, E.; Heindel, L.; Heindel, N.; Orrichio, A.; Runkle, R.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Gordon, C.; Heindel, N.; Metzso, J.; Wilson, N.; Bubbenmoyer, S.</p>	<p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culturally Significant and Historically Registered Properties. 	<p>In developing the proposed route for the pipeline, PennEast considered potential impacts to culturally sensitive areas, including historic buildings. During the permitting process, PennEast will consult with the various state and federal agencies that oversee these areas and work with them and landowners to avoid or minimize impacts to culturally sensitive areas.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, PennEast will identify cultural resources within the Project's area of potential effect (APE) and make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places to FERC and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (54 U.S.C. 306108, 2015). 15 federally recognized Native American tribes with a demonstrated interest in the Project area were contacted and given the opportunity to solicit their input. PennEast is making extensive efforts to avoid cultural resources during the siting process.</p> <p>Section 4.5 of Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources will present the results of cultural resource investigations in the Project's APE and provide avoidance or mitigation measures adopted by the Project.</p>
<p>LO 6 - Dutko, F.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Gorelli, J.; Joseph Cedar Family Memorial Trust; Kenny, T.; Kohler, E.; Lamson, J.; Markus, W.; Matybell, B.; Schweitzer, G.; Seier, C.; Seier, C.; Seier, F.; Seier, R.; Sommo, T.; Switzler, E.; Tucci, E.; Waldron, J.; Weber, C.; Bernet, G.; Cook, L.; DiBianca, V.; Dutko Jr, F.; Heindel, L.; Heindel, N.; Lick, T.; Matyas, J.; Matyas, R.; Paulus, J.; Paulus, W.; Rader, R.; Shafer, J.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Swiatek, J.; Swiatek, R.; Wilson, N.</p>	<p>Purpose and Need for the Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pipelines will be added to the easement in the future 	<p>Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 7 - Buchanan, T.; DiBianca, V.; Dutko, F.; Feinberg, J.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Griffith, D.; Hanson, A.; Kenny, T.; Kidd, T.; Kohler, E.; Leap, G.; Leeds, M.; Mackey, C.; Markus, W.; Matybell, B.; Salata, G.; Salavantis, H.; Schweitzer, G.; Seier, C.; Seier, F.; Seier, R.; Soloman, N.; Waldron, J.; Weber, C.; Buschmann, C.; Cole, A.; Dutko Jr, F.; Kuenstner, C.; Seier, M.; Seier, N.; Seier, S.; Shafer, J.; Snitker, C.; Snitker, N.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Wilson, N.; Seggerman, T.; Smith, C.; Smith, L.; Weber, C.</p>	<p>Socioeconomics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreasing property values • Insurance Rates • Tourism 	<p>There are millions of miles of pipelines throughout the country and, thus, there are a considerable number of properties near pipelines. A report by Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc., which was prepared in 2001 for the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, Inc., evaluated the impact of natural gas pipelines on real estate in four separate and geographically diverse areas, including two suburban areas and two rural areas crossed by one to multiple natural gas pipelines. The study concluded that there was no significant impact on property sales located along natural gas pipelines due to the pipeline size or the product carried. Additionally, other studies have reached similar conclusions: PGP Valuation Inc. (2008) for Palomar Gas Transmission Inc.; Ecowest (Fruits, 2008) for the Oregon LNG Project; Diskin, Friedman, Peppas, and Peppas (2011); and Hansen et al. (2006).</p> <p>The National Association of Insurance Commissioners provides a consumer guide on homeowners insurance, which does not indicate that the presence of utilities is a factor that is considered in obtaining or maintaining an insurance policy (NAIC, 2010).</p> <p>According to an Economic Impact Analysis prepared by Econsult Solutions and Drexel University School of Economics, the Project will have a substantial positive economic impact on Pennsylvania and New Jersey residents, commercial businesses, industrial production plants and power generation. The benefits include 12,160 supported jobs with a labor income of \$740 million during the construction of the Project and 98 supported jobs with a labor income of \$8.3 million throughout the ongoing operations (Econsult Solutions and Drexel University, 2015).</p> <p>Tourism is significant contributor to the economies within the Project area. The effects on outdoor recreation areas, a main tourist attraction throughout the Project area, will be minimized through co-location and agency coordination, lessening the overall impact of the Project on tourism.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 8 - Briede, D.; DiBianca, V.; Heck, R.; Kager Family; Kohler, R.; Leap, G.; Mineo, I.; Mineo, L.; Onstott, T.; Rader, S.; Runkle, K.; Schweitzer, G.; Switzler, E.; Tucci, E.; Tucci, V.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Bernet, G.; Buschmann, C.; Cook, L.; Lick, J.; Lick, T.; Lugara, J.; Orrichio, A.; Paulus, J.; Paulus, W.; Peterman, B.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Swiatek, J.; Swiatek, R.</p>	<p>Geologic Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arsenic-bearing iron pyrite mineral beds • (Triassic shale in the Passaic/Lockatong Formations) • Potential for earthquakes due to proximity to fault zone of the Triassic Newark Basin • Blasting • Release of radioactive radon in the form of dust through excavation • Degraded soils and impacting geologic formations • Potential for sinkholes • Close proximity to quarries 	<p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, and flash flooding.</p> <p>The high grade steel to be used to manufacture the pipeline will minimize sinkhole risks. Piping, such as that planned for the Project, can withstand loss of subgrade support of over 100 feet in length without being compromised. Should a sinkhole occur, PennEast would immediately address the situation by properly shoring the pipeline.</p> <p>PennEast has conducted a Seismic Hazard Analysis for the pipeline, including along the Ramapo fault zone in New Jersey. Initial results of the analysis found that the probability of surface fault hazard to the pipeline was deemed well below the probabilities considered for engineering design and therefore insignificant.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised about the concentrations of radon in natural gas produced from certain wells. The Commission has addressed the radon concentration of natural gas in multiple certificate proceedings, including recently in CP14-96-000. The Environmental Impact Statement in that proceeding cited to a July 2012 study of natural gas samples collected from Texas Eastern and Algonquin pipelines from the Marcellus shale gas fields (Anspaugh, 2012). The study found that radon concentrations in natural gas pipelines are significantly less than the average indoor and outdoor radon levels. Based on all of the available studies, including the Anspaugh study, the Staff concluded that the risk of exposure to radon is not significant. Environmental Impact Statement at 4-244, Docket No. CP14-96-000 (Jan. 23, 2015). The Commission confirmed this determination in its certificate order in CP14-96 issued on March 3, 2015.</p> <p>The USGS recognizes that arsenic occurs naturally in trace amounts in rocks, sediments, and coal. Arsenic occurs in some ground-water aquifers due to chemical oxidation of pyrite or to reduction (the opposite of oxidation) of iron oxide minerals in the aquifer. Small amounts of arsenic may be present in local ground water wells particularly where there is a nearby source of arsenic. Water quality testing of potentially affected wells prior to construction can identify if this is a concern. Post construction testing can identify, if arsenic was present, if the levels of arsenic have increased to beyond safe drinking water levels. In the unlikely event that permanent impacts have occurred to a well due to the construction of the Project, rendering the water unsafe for drinking, PennEast will replace or provide an alternate water source.</p> <p>Resource Report 6 – Geology will include a complete analysis of the geology in the Project area.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 9 - Anthony, A.; Brook Hollow Farms; Buchanan, T.; Bydalek, M.; Carrick, G.; DeGrado, V.; Dezura, A.; DiBianca, V.; Fisher, C.; Godown, R.; Gorelli, L.; Hanson, A.; Jones, S.; Joseph Cedar Family Memorial Trust; Karcher, C.; Kelly, E.; Kenny, T.; Kohler, A.; Kohler, R.; Mackey, C.; Matybell, B.; Mineo, I.; Mineo, L.; Moore, J.; Nejman, S.; Richard, A.; Runkle, C.; Runkle, K.; Rushatz, R.; Sauer, L.; Seier, C.; Soloman, N.; Sommo, T.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Wheaton, M.; Bernet, G.; Bubbenmoyer, S.; Buschmann, C.; Cole, J.; Culver, B.; Heindel, L.; Heindel, N.; Kirby, A.; Lilly, A.; Lilly, D.; Matyas, J.; Matyas, R.; Peterman, B.; Rader, R.; Runkle, R.; Shinsec, P.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Spolar, W.; Toth, R.; Wagner, G.; Seier, S.; Christman, R.; Heindel, N.; Plevretes, T.; Weber, C.; Connor, D.</p>	<p>Preserved Lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baldpate Mountain • Ted Stiles Preserve • Brook Hollow Farms • Highlands 	<p>Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to preserved open space and other conserved properties. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to reduce fragmentation of preserved areas. A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with relevant agencies, conservation groups and land owners to develop suitable measures to minimize disturbances to preserved open space and conserved lands, and to fairly compensate for potential impacts. Effects to preserved open space and conserved lands will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored to their original condition following construction activities in accordance with FERC restoration conditions and approved restoration plans by the relevant agencies.</p> <p>Following construction of the pipeline, disturbed areas will be stabilized and reseeded in accordance with the seeding recommendations of the local Conservation District or land managing agency. Trees and other woody vegetation will be allowed to re-vegetate naturally within the temporary pipeline construction ROW and extra workspaces. Additionally, PennEast will implement restoration measures in accordance with its agency-approved E&S and Site Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate vegetation and habitat resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p> <p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will evaluate various land uses in the Project area including Natural, Recreational, and Scenic Areas and Public or Conservation Land.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 10 - Anderson,N.; Buchanan, T.; Dell, A.; Hamill, J.; King, D.; Sayles, C.; Switzler, E.; Baker, C.; Bernet, G.; Cole, A.; Cole, J.; Cook, L.; Dibianca, V.; Lick, T.; Paulus, J.; Rader, R.; Runkle, R.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Spolar, W.; Wagner, G.; Seier, S.; Seier, R.</p>	<p>Land Use and Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certified organic farms • Loss of farmland • Loss of specific species • Specialty crops • Targeting farmland in a deliberate effort to avoid higher costs of Class 3 requirements • Sand Colic 	<p>On any pipeline ROW, proper restoration will be required and monitored throughout the FERC process. After construction, the ROW will be regarded, seeded, and temporary erosion control devices will be installed, according to laws, regulations and improved BMP. As a BMP for farming, when the ROW is prepared for construction, any topsoil that is present is carefully stripped off the top and stockpiled on the edge of the ROW, separate from any excavated subsoil. Once pipeline construction is completed, the topsoil will be returned to the ROW and restored to the original grade. Farming activities can resume as they did before construction and yields should not be materially affected in the long term.</p> <p>PennEast will employ third party environmental inspectors to monitor all construction and restoration activities to maintain compliance with all E&S plans, FERC Order conditions, other environmental permits and approvals and environmental requirements in landowner agreements.</p> <p>PennEast will work with farmers to measure both pre- and post-construction crop yields until such time as yields have reached pre-construction levels. PennEast will compensate farmers for impacts to crop yields caused by the Project and will work diligently to eliminate the impact. Agricultural lands will be restored using approved, modern mitigation techniques designed to reestablish pre-existing productive use of the agricultural lands, which is typically within 3 years following Project completion.</p> <p>PennEast's first priority in siting the pipeline is to avoid areas of high development density and places where large groups gather. PennEast's preferred alternative route reflects these efforts.</p>
<p>LO 11 - DeGrado, V.; Hanson, A.; Kohler, E.; Kullick, R.; MacClay, C.; Runkle, K.; Seier, F.; Tucci, E.; Weber, C.; William, R.; Wolferman, S.; Andrejko, J.; Lick, J.; Paulus, W.; Rader, R.; Runkle, R.; Seier, M.; Seier, R.; Seier, S.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Swiatek, J.; Swiatek, R.; Tucci, V.; Wagner, G.; Weber, C.</p>	<p>Air and Noise Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gases 	<p>All potential impacts to air quality will be evaluated in accordance with PADEP and FERC regulatory requirements. Any emitting equipment used at the compressor station will meet or exceed PADEP Best Available Technology emissions standards and guidelines. Impacts will adhere to all applicable state and federal regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Although there are currently no regulatory requirements in place (either at a federal or state level) that limit carbon dioxide emissions from a facility, proper combustion techniques combined with high efficiency equipment can minimize the production of carbon dioxide and the emissions of associated greenhouse gases (GHGs). In terms of direct methane leaks from the natural gas supply, routine maintenance and proper construction of the pipeline will substantially reduce fugitive emissions from the equipment. All construction and maintenance will be in accordance with pertinent state and federal regulations.</p> <p>Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality will provide a complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air and noise in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 12 - Benson, P.; Buchanan, T.; Bydalek, M.; DiBianca, V.; Feary, V.; Griffith, D.; Griffith, J.; Hanson, A.; Leap, G.; McAdam, J.; Mineo, L.; Switzler, E.; Weidel, R.; Weber, C.</p>	<p>Pipeline ROW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion regarding whether or not property is within 400ft study corridor • Concerns about co-location • Concern with how routing was decided • Preferred route intersects a paved driveway on property 	<p>Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to preserved open space and other conserved properties. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to reduce fragmentation of preserved areas. A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.</p> <p>Resource Report 10 – Alternatives provides a detailed analysis regarding the routing of the PennEast Pipeline.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will include Residential Construction Techniques for instances where structures fall within 50 feet of the centerline. Specific property concerns will be addressed on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>LO 13 - Aliciene, J.; Carrick, G.; DeGrado, V.; Dezura, A.; Dezura, J.; DiBianca, V.; Fleischman, O.; Gorelli, L.; Griffith, D.; Griffith, J.; Hanson, A.; Joseph Cedar Family Memorial Trust; Kager Family; Kelly, E.; Kenny, T.; Kohler, E.; Kullick, R.; Lamson, J.; Leap, G.; Leeds, M.; Markus, W.; Matybell, B.; Mineo, L.; Moore, J.; Ravidpinto, F.; Rushatz, R.; Schweitzer, G.; Seier, C.; Smith, N.; Sommo, T.; Switzler, E.; Tucci, E.; Waldron, J.; Waldron, W.; Andrejko, J.; Bernet, G.; Cole, A.; Lick, J.; Lick, T.; Lilly, A.; Lilly, D.; Seier, M.; Seier, N.; Seier, R.; Seier, S.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Tucci, V.; Wilson, N.; Seier, N.; Seier, R.; Mineo, L.; Wilson, N.; Schooley, J.; Plevretes, T.; Bubbenmoyer, K.; Bubbenmoyer, S.; Shinsec, P.</p>	<p>Health and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explosions • Gas leaks • Ability of emergency response crews to handle situation appropriately • Proximity of pipeline to overhead electrical transmission lines • Proximity to schools • Blasting • Pipe deterioration • Quality of life • Lightning strikes • ROW maintenance procedure • Proximity to home 	<p>PennEast will comply with the pipeline safety standards established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) (49 CFR §190-199). Pipelines are the safest, most environmentally-friendly and efficient mode of transporting energy, according to PHMSA. Data shows that while natural gas demand has increased, serious pipeline incidents have decreased by 90 percent over the past three decades alone, primarily as a result of significant efforts by pipeline companies to upgrade and modernize their infrastructure. Transportation by pipeline is the safest mode of transportation.</p> <p>Safety is PennEast's highest priority when designing pipelines. PennEast adopts design features and operating practices that meet or exceed stringent industry and regulatory standards. PennEast will regularly walk the PennEast Pipeline, conduct leak surveys and send sensor equipment through the line to make sure integrity has not been compromised. PennEast will continuously monitor (24/7/365) how much gas is transported through the system, operating pressures and temperatures throughout the system, and other critical operating data. This is done in real-time through our gas control center. Should any unusual data surface, PennEast will immediately dispatch field personnel to address the issue and protect the community. Additionally, the pipeline will be clearly marked at all road crossings, creeks, property lines, and fence lines to minimize the potential for third-party damage. PennEast will be a member of the national 1-Call system (Dial 811) that requires anyone performing excavations to call 3 days prior so that the line can be located and marked in the area of excavation.</p> <p>Local emergency response and management personnel will receive emergency response training prior to the Project being placed into service and on an ongoing basis thereafter. Necessary information and instructions regarding the facilities will be provided to local emergency response and management personnel. A plan will be in place for coordination between PennEast and local emergency response and management personnel in the event of an incident.</p> <p>PennEast is designing the Project to exceed federal safety regulations in many important areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pipe material will meet and generally exceed the API-5L requirements; • Class 2 pipe will be installed in all Class 1 locations in order to increase safety factor; • 100 percent nondestructive inspection of mainline welds (for example 49 CRF 192 requires only 10 percent of the welds to be tested in Class 1 locations); and

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>LO 14 - Dezura, A.; Hanson, A.; Sauer, L.; Seier, C.; Switzler, E.; Weber, C.; Wissig, M.; Smith, L.; Smith, C.; Seier, N.</p>	<p>FERC Scoping Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping period extension • Properly prepared EIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to placing the line into service, the pipe will be hydrostatically tested at a maximum pressure that will exceed industry standards identified in 49 CFR 192. <p>The high grade steel utilized in the manufacture of the pipeline makes pipe deterioration less of a concern for projects such as PennEast.</p> <p>No pesticides will be used in the maintenance of the pipeline ROW.</p> <p>Resource Report 11 – Reliability and Safety will evaluate the overall safety of the project through construction and pipeline operation and presents the extensive safety measures, emergency procedures, and oversight that will be adopted and implemented for the project.</p> <p>FERC has provided an extension and additional meeting to address weather conditions and concerns.</p> <p>The Commission accepted PennEast into the pre-filing process on October 10, 2013, and since that date the Commission Staff has accepted comments on the docket, including during the scoping period, and the Commission Staff will continue accepting comments throughout the pre-filing process. Stakeholders will have opportunities to file further comments following PennEast's filing of the formal certificate application, including an opportunity to file comments following the issuance of the draft EIS.</p> <p>FERC is managing the preparation of a Third-Party EIS in accordance with applicable Federal regulations and requirements.</p>
<p>LO 15 - Baker, C.; Bernet, G.; Cook, L.; Lick, J.; Lick, T.; Matyas, J.; Matyas, R.; Orrichio, A.; Paulus, J.; Snyder, D.; Snyder, M.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Swiatek, J.; Swiatek, R.; Metzo, J.</p>	<p>Erosion and Sedimentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts to runoff/soil compaction • Flooding • Drainage patterns 	<p>PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Prior to construction, PennEast will be required to submit detailed erosion and sediment control (E&S) plans to both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection or county conservation districts. Upon approval, PennEast will employ related BMPs during construction to prevent erosion in accordance with the approved plans, as well as applicable regulations and permits. After restoration, PennEast is responsible for maintaining the permanent rights-of-way (ROW) while the pipeline remains in operation. Federal and state regulatory agencies will inspect and monitor the area to maintain compliance with all regulations and permits.</p> <p>Construction plans for the Project will be permitted through the NPDES and reviewed or approved by the state DEP, County Conservation Districts, and River Basin Commissions. PennEast will employ approved BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>PennEast's E&S and Site Restoration Plan will be included in its FERC application as Appendix E.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
LO 16 - Bubbenmoyer, S.; Heindel, L.; Heindel, N.; Mineo, I.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.	Blasting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearby quarries 	<p>To the extent where bedrock is encountered, PennEast would first attempt to use mechanical methods such as excavation or ripping to remove bedrock, where practicable. Blasting will be employed if other methods cannot successfully remove rock to the appropriate depth. Blasting is done in compliance with all applicable permits and regulations. PennEast will implement a project blasting plan that will provide specific procedures, safety measures, notification processes, and other required protocols that will be employed during blasting activities while utilizing only licensed and qualified contractors. Proper notifications to surrounding landowners will be provided well in advance of any potential blasting.</p> <p>Today, the use of blasting is a very controlled and minimally impactful method to extract rock in many construction projects from single site development to linear projects such as pipelines. Current blasting techniques for pipeline construction use very carefully placed charges that are positioned in a manner to control the direction and velocity of the blast. Modeling is used to assess the pattern and distance of the blasting. Following construction a supplemental inspection will be conducted.</p>
LO 17 - Bubbenmoyer, S.; Dutko Jr, F.; Dutko, F.; Heindel, L.; Heindel, N.; Lick, J.; Mineo, I.; Shinsec, P.; Spille, K.; Spille, M.; Mineo, L.	Alternatives Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-pipeline alternative No Action Alternative Systems Alternative Alternative Energy Alternative 	<p>Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.</p> <p>Resource Report 10 – Alternatives provides a detailed analysis regarding the routing of the PennEast Pipeline and an evaluation of alternatives to the Project.</p>
LO 18 - Orrichio, A.; Seier, N. .; Seier, R.	Insurance for Pipeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homeowners Businesses 	<p>With respect to homeowner's insurance, any claim that a homeowner would either be unable to obtain insurance or that premiums would increase as a result of a pipeline on their property has not been substantiated. According to a U.S Energy Information Administration report, in 2008, there were over 300,000 miles of natural gas pipelines in the lower 48 states. Pipelines have co-existed with residential property for many years, and PennEast is unaware of insurance underwriters refusing to issue homeowner's insurance due to the presence of a natural gas pipeline. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has a consumer guide in homeowner's insurance that can be found at www.naic.org. In no place is there any question of utilities being a factor in obtaining or maintaining an insurance policy.</p> <p>With respect to liability insurance, PennEast will be insured with sufficient types and amounts of insurance commensurate with similarly sized companies, with similar types of assets, to appropriately respond to any pipeline incident. Further, PennEast will require its subcontractors to maintain appropriate types and amounts of insurance commensurate with their respective construction responsibilities. These coverages will extend to landowners from the start of the survey process through the lifetime of the pipeline.</p>

Diskin, Barry A., Jack P. Friedman, Spero C. Peppas, Stephanie R. Peppas. 2011. The Effect of Natural Gas Pipelines on Residential Value. International Right of Way Online Journal. Available at: http://www.irwaonline.org/eweb/upload/web_jan_NaturalGas.pdf. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

Econsult Solutions and Drexel University. 2015. Economic Impact Report and Analysis: PennEast Pipeline Project Economic Impact Analysis. Available at: <http://penneastpipeline.com/economic-impact-analysis/>. Accessed on February 17, 2015.

Fruits, Eric. 2008. Natural Gas Pipelines and Residential Property Values: Evidence from Clackamas and Washington Counties. *ECONorthwest*. February 20, 2008.

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation (INGAA). 2001. Natural Gas Pipeline Impact Study. <http://www.ingaa.org/Foundation/Studies/FoundationReports/207.aspx>. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). 2010. A Consumer's Guide to Home Insurance. Available at: http://www.naic.org/documents/consumer_guide_home.pdf. Accessed on February 19, 2015.

49 CFR §190-199. 2015. Pipeline Safety Regulations. Available online at: <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/SafetyStandards.htm>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

54 U.S.C. 306108. 2015. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). Section 106: Regulations. Available online at: <http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Fact Sheet 2005-3152, February 2006

Table 4: Other Stakeholder Comments January 13 – February 27, 2015

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 1 - Anderson, A.; Anderson, N.; Arlotta, M.; Armocida, F.; Attardo, P.; Ayers, T.; Badman, A.; Balogh, E.; Bell, J.; Benioff, M.; Benioff, R.; Bordelon, C.; Bound Jr, R.; Bydalek, M.; Canright, M.; Cantor, G.; Clark, P.; Collins, K.; Crofts, B.; Crombie, A.; Crown, J.; Crown, L.; Dawson, M.; Demena, D.; Dodds, J.; Eckel, C.; Eckel, R.; Ecker, T.; Elinich, D.; Elinich, M.; Ely, D.; Etheridge, C.; Evans, B.; Fara, L.; Fink, C.; Gaffney, F.; Gallagher, M.; Gibson, S.; Gochko, E.; Greeny, A.; Grillo, J.; Grimshaw, S.; Haberle, H.; Hanson, A.; Harbin, W.; Harr, K.; Harris, F.; Haynes-Johnson, D.; Hinesley, G.; Homeyer, C.; Hutter, F.; Janiszewski, D.; Juleff, G.; Karas, D.; Keith, C.; Kelleher, S.; Kippel, P.; Kydd, S.; Larore, D.; Lee, B.; Leitch, M.; Lewine, S.; Lindall, C.; Litschauer, R.; Loria, D.; Lowry, L.; M, E.; Magee, S.; Marshall, A.; Martin, C.; Martin, J.; Martin, L.; Mcgrath, S.; Mcgurty, N.; Meacham, S.; Mendelson, S.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Meyers, C.; Miller, G.; Mills, A.; Mirsky, L.; Mitchell, D.; Nalesnik, E.; Neary, C.; Nini, D.; O'Brien, B.; Oddo, C.; Pansi, M.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Phoneix, S.; Pope, S.; Pritchard, L.; Raichel, D.; Ramos, J.; Rankin-Baransky, K.; Rawley, M.; Rawlins, R.; Redmond, A.; Robbins, J.; Rodriguez, A.; Roggie, J.; Safer, R.; Sauer, L.; Sauter, L.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schmidt, E.; Schmidt, M.; Shedd, D.; Sheetz, R.; Slatkin, D.; Slotter, C.; Sobreyra, A.; Spence, J.; Spolar, T.; Student II, J.; Suthers, H.; Syrnick, M.; Tai, H.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Tiscio, L.; Tomczak, B.; Traina, A.; Voronin, L.; Wang, J.; Washburn, D.; Washburn, W.; Winston, D.; Wolferman, S.; Yeash, L.; Zaleabos, M.; Zapatha, B.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; Anderson, A.; Ayers, T.; Bond, F.; Cordaro, N.; Cordaro, V.; Cronheim, P.; deMena, D.; Dubiel, M.; Elinich, A.; Elinich, K.; Engel, J.; Fazekas, T.; Gallagher, M.; Garofalini, S.; Germanoski, D.; Goetz, W.; Gordon, C.; Harbin, W.; Harris, R.; Hertzog, K.; Hochenberger, K.; Huff, R.;</p>	<p>Surface Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cat 1 waters, HQ/EV waters • Shoppun's Run • Cooks Creek • Lockatong Creek • Wickecheoke Creek • Fry's Run • Gallows Run • Delaware River/Delaware River Basin • Highlands • Susquehanna River • Lehigh River • Wetlands • Channel stability 	<p>PennEast has used the siting process to avoid and/or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Additionally, it is planned that horizontal directional drill (HDD), bores, and other dry crossing techniques such as flume pipes and dam and pump will be used to cross many waterbodies. The use of these best management practices (BMPs) will maintain the designated water quality, and there should be no long-term impact to water quality downstream of any of these features. PennEast plans to construct and restore these areas in accordance with the rules and regulations of various regulatory agencies and will maintain compliance with these requirements through environmental inspection during the construction and restoration time period.</p> <p>Stream crossings for the pipeline will be permitted through the NPDES and reviewed or approved by the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), County Conservation Districts, River Basin Commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. PennEast will employ BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.</p> <p>Erosion and loss of sediment filtration/increased runoff will be avoided through the implementation of approved Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plans. The Project is also subject to FERC and PA/NJ Stormwater regulations, and will implement the required practices to address water quality, quantity, and groundwater recharge.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate existing surface water and wetland resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
Kellner, W.; Maher, S.; Martin, T.; McLennan, S.; Mendelson, S.; Opathof, L.; Opathof, M.; Orben, D.; Orben, J.; Orben, J.; Panuski, A.; Panuski, A.; Pichel, K.; Robinson, K.; Rodriguez, A.; Romano, R.; Rusinski, R.; Sauer, M.; Schmidt, R.; Slingerland, S.; Thomas, K.; Venini, J.; Wolferman, S.; Gibson, B.; Guilmartin, K.; Gallagher, M.; Grady, H.; Hoy, R.; Kornak, L.; Connor, D.; Zaino, A.	Surface Water Resources (continued)	
OSH 2 - Adler, B.; Anderson, N.; Arlotta, M.; Armocida, F.; Attardo, P.; Ayers, T.; Bound Jr, R.; Brosky, A.; Bydalek, M.; Cantor, G.; Chandler, M.; Clark, P.; Collins, K.; Coss, A.; Crown, J.; Crown, L.; Dejesus, M.; Demena, D.; Dodds, J.; Eckel, C.; Eckel, R.; Ecker, T.; Elinich, D.; Ely, D.; Evans, B.; Fara, L.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Fink, C.; Gallagher, M.; Grillo, J.; Haberle, H.; Hanson, A.; Harbin, W.; Harr, K.; Harris, F.; Hencheck, B.; Hencheck, J.; Hinesley, G.; Hutter, F.; Juleff, G.; Karas, D.; Kelleher, S.; Kippel, P.; Larore, D.; Lee, B.; Lewine, S.; Lewis, N.; Litschauer, R.; Loria, D.; M, E.; Marshall, A.; Martin, C.; Martin, L.; Mcgurty, N.; Mehta, A.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Meyers, C.; Miller, G.; Mills, A.; Mirsky, L.; Mitchell, D.; Neary, C.; O'Brien, B.; Pansi, M.; Pope, S.; Pritchard, L.; Raichel, D.; Robbins, J.; Robinson, K.; Roggie, J.; Rothman, R.; Sauter, L.; Schaible, J.; Schmidt, E.; Schmidt, M.; Shedd, D.; Slatkin, D.; Soloman, N.; Spolar, T.; Syrnick, M.; Tai, H.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Tiscio, L.; Tomczak, B.; Trautman, M.; Voronin, L.; Wang, J.; Washburn, D.; Washburn, W.; Zaleabos, M.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; Ayers, T.; Bond, F.; Cronheim, P.; Gallagher, M.; Germanoski, D.; Goetz, W.; Gordon, C.; Harbin, W.; Harris, R.; Hertzog, K.; Hochenberger, K.; Kellner, W.; Kovitch, R.; Leshik, F.; Lewine, S.; Maher, S.; Mendelson, S.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; Orben, J.; Orben, J.; Robinson, K.; Romano, R.; Rusinski, R.; Schmidt, R.; Scott, J.; Venini, J.; Gibson, B.; Guilmartin, K.; Gallagher, M.; DiGrazia, K.; DiGrazia, V.; Grady, H.; Hoy, R.; Kornak, L.; Zaino, A.	Groundwater Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arsenic contamination from the Triassic shales of the Passaic and Lockatong Formations 	<p>PennEast is using a critical issues assessment process to identify sensitive resource areas, and then work with engineering to avoid or minimize potential impacts. In combination with the use of BMPs, these efforts will maintain designated groundwater quality within the Project area.</p> <p>During construction, equipment is inspected on a daily basis for integrity. Fueling activities will be restricted as specified in a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. In the unlikely event of a leak or breach in the pipeline, the natural gas would rise to the ground surface and dissipate in the air. There are no liquids in the pipeline that would be released to groundwater.</p> <p>The Project will not impact groundwater recharge ability, groundwater sources, or impede flow rate.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of Resource Report 2 – Water Use and Quality will evaluate ground water resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 3 - Chandler, M.; Collins, K.; Conroy, J.; Crown, L.; deJesus, M.; Etheridge, C.; Fox, K.; Fraser, L.; Hanson, A.; Harr, K.; Keith, C.; Kippel, P.; Kullick, R.; Larore, D.; Lewine, S.; Lewis, N.; MacClay, C.; Martin, J.; Mccaffrey, M.; McGurty, N.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Miller, G.; O'Brien, B.; Pope, S.; Pritchard, L.; Raichel, D.; Rankin-Baransky, K.; Robinson, K.; Roggie, J.; Schmidt, E.; Schmidt, M.; Slatkin, D.; Spence, J.; Syrnick, M.; Tai, H.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Thall, L.; William, R.; Wolferman, S.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; Dubiel, M.; Leshik, F.; Martin, T.; McVeigh, G.; O'Shea, F.; Orben, D.; Panuski, A.; Scott, J.; Eisinger, S.; Goetz, W.; Roedell, E.; Wolferman, S.; Gibson, B.; Hoy, R.; Connor, D.</p>	<p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for radon contamination • Climate change due to methane leaks/release 	<p>Concerns have been raised about the concentrations of radon in natural gas produced from certain wells. The Commission has addressed the radon concentration of natural gas in multiple certificate proceedings, including recently in CP14-96-000. The Environmental Impact Statement in that proceeding cited to a July 2012 study of natural gas samples collected from Texas Eastern and Algonquin pipelines from the Marcellus shale gas fields (Anspaugh, 2012). The study found that radon concentrations in natural gas pipelines are significantly less than the average indoor and outdoor radon levels. Based on all of the available studies, including the Anspaugh study, the Staff concluded that the risk of exposure to radon is not significant. Environmental Impact Statement at 4-244, Docket No. CP14-96-000 (Jan. 23, 2015). The Commission confirmed this determination in its certificate order in CP14-96 issued on March 3, 2015.</p> <p>Potential impacts to air quality will be evaluated in accordance with PADEP and FERC regulatory requirements. Emitting equipment used at the compressor station will meet or exceed PADEP Best Available Technology (BAT) emissions standards and guidelines. Impacts will adhere to all applicable state and federal regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality will provide a complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to air and noise in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project.</p>
<p>OSH 4 - Arlotta, M.; Ayers, T.; Balogh, E.; Bell, J.; Cantor, G.; Cleveland, L.; Crombie, A.; Deaver, K.; Dodds, J.; Dotsko, D.; Evans, B.; Gibson, B.; Gochko, E.; Haberle, H.; Hotz, J.; Hutter, F.; Juleff, G.; Kelleher, S.; Lowry, L.; Magee, S.; Martin, L.; Meacham, S.; Mershon, J.; Mirsky, L.; Nalesnik, E.; Nini, D.; O'Brien, B.; O'Mara, M.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Pritchard, L.; Rankin-Baransky, K.; Rawlins, R.; Rizzello, A.; Robbins, J.; Robinson, K.; Roggie, J.; Slatkin, D.; Spolar, T.; Suthers, H.; Swain, E.; Syrnick, M.; Taylor, C.; Thall, L.; Tiscio, L.; Voronin, L.; Wilcove, D.; Wolferman, S.; Zapatha, B.; Zuzov, J.; -, N.; McLennan, -; Ayers, T.; Cronheim, P.; D'Amour, S.; Elinich, A.; engel, j.; Fazekas, T.; Gallagher, M.; Goetz, W.; Gordon, C.; Harbin, W.; Hawk, D.; Hertzog, K.; Mendelson, S.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; Opathof, L.; Opathof, M.; Orben, D.; Orben, J.; Slingerland, S.</p>	<p>Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flying squirrel • Bald eagle • Blue heron • Box turtle • Wood turtle • Spotted salamander • Mountain lion • Bobolink • Northern Harrier Hawk/Marsh Hawk • T&E migratory birds 	<p>Consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and state agencies are currently ongoing relative to rare, threatened and endangered species (including protected birds, reptiles, and mammals), associated habitats and protocols for field surveys. Potential habitats have been mapped from federal and state databases. Where practicable, the pipeline route is being adjusted to avoid protected habitats. Preliminary field surveys are being conducted where access permission has been granted. If it is determined that the pipeline route cannot be adjusted to avoid areas of concern, other avoidance and mitigation measures will be evaluated, such as, construction using bores and HDD, timing restrictions and other previously approved techniques and will be addressed through the environmental permitting and FERC Environmental Impact Statement process.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate the threatened and endangered species in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 5 - Arlotta, M.; Attardo, P.; Ayers, T.; Balogh, E.; Barry, J.; Bell, J.; Bell, J.; Benioff, M.; Benioff, R.; Blackman, E.; Bound Jr, R.; Bydalek, M.; Canright, M.; Cantor, G.; Cleveland, L.; Coss, A.; Crombie, A.; Crown, L.; Daniels, C.; Deaver, K.; Deleon, P.; Dodds, J.; Dotsko, D.; Eckel, C.; Eckel, R.; Elinich, D.; Etheridge, C.; Fraser, L.; Gallagher, M.; Garay, M.; Gibson, B.; Gore, H.; Grillo, J.; Grimshaw, S.; Haberle, H.; Hanson, A.; Harris, F.; Hotz, J.; Huebner, L.; Hutter, F.; Johnson, J.; Joseph Ceadar Family Memorial Trust; Juleff, G.; Kelleher, S.; Kydd, S.; Lombardo, R.; Martin, C.; Martin, L.; Martinkovic, J.; Mcelroy, T.; Mcgrath, S.; Meacham, S.; Mehta, A.; Mendelson, S.; Mershon, J.; Miller, G.; Mirsky, L.; Neary, C.; O'brien, B.; Oleksa, D.; Omelia, E.; Phoneix, S.; Pressel, M.; Raichel, D.; Reed, K.; Richard, A.; Rizzello, A.; Robbi, A.; Rodriguez, A.; Roggie, J.; Sauer, L.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schmidt, M.; Seems, D.; Sheetz, R.; Slatkin, D.; Soloman, N.; Spolar, T.; Steele, J.; Suthers, H.; Swain, E.; Syrnick, M.; Tai, H.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Thall, L.; Thall, L.; Thompson, E.; Tiscio, L.; Washburn, D.; Washburn, W.; Wilcove, D.; Wilson Jr, C.; Wolferman, S.; Young, M.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; D.; Ayers, T.; Carpenter, S.; Chief Robert Red Hawk Ruth; Christensen, D.; Cickay, S.; Eisinger, S.; Ely, C.; Germanoski, D.; Goetz, W.; Harbin, W.; Harris, R.; Hertzog, K.; Hricak, G.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; Opathof, L.; Opathof, M.; Orben, J.; Panuski, A.; Reuscher, C.; Rodriquez, A.; Romano, R.; Rusinski, R.; Schmidt, R.; Scott, J.; Venini, J.; Waskow, S.; Werkheiser, F.; Zakutansky, M.; Ayers, T.; Chief Robert Red Hawk Ruth; Christensen, D.; Gallagher, M.; Germanoski, D.; Goetz, W.; Harbin, W.; Harris, R.; Hertzog, K.; Kohut, D.; Merkel, B.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; Orben, J.; Reuscher, C.; Rusinski, R.; Sauer, M.; Slingerland, S.; Werkheiser, F.; deMena, D.; McLennan, R.; DiGrazia, K.; DiGrazia, V.; Byrom, R.; Mergentime, A.; Grady, H.; Rasmussen, W.; Hoy, R.; Zaino, A.</p>	<p>Preserved natural areas/open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NJ Green Acres Land • Louise K. Moore Park • Hexenkopf Rock area • Francis E Walter Dam • Mosey Wood Wetlands • Lake Harmony Big Boulder Lake andSki Area • Jack Frost Golf and Ski Area • Mud Run Natural Area • Blue Mountain and Appalachian Trail • Green Pond/Green Pond Marsh • Matson's Woods • Sourland Mountain and Baldpate • Mountain Ridges • Wildlife habitat • Forests 	<p>Efforts are being made during the siting process to avoid potential impacts to preserved open space and other conserved properties. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing utility ROW wherever possible (e.g. gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to reduce fragmentation of preserved areas. A significant portion of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROW.</p> <p>PennEast is coordinating with relevant agencies, conservation groups and land owners to develop suitable measures to minimize disturbances to preserved open space and conserved lands, and to fairly compensate for potential impacts. Effects to preserved open space and conserved lands will be primarily temporary in nature, as most areas will be restored to their original condition following construction activities in accordance with FERC restoration conditions and approved restoration plans by the relevant agencies.</p> <p>Following construction of the pipeline, disturbed areas will be stabilized and reseeded in accordance with the seeding recommendations of the local Conservation District or land managing agency. Trees and other woody vegetation will be allowed to re-vegetate naturally within the temporary pipeline construction ROW and extra workspaces. Additionally, PennEast will implement restoration measures in accordance with its agency-approved E&S and Site Restoration Plan.</p> <p>Resource Report 3 – Fisheries, Vegetation, and Wildlife will evaluate vegetation and habitat resources in the Project area and discuss potential impacts and mitigation plans.</p> <p>Resource Report 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics will evaluate various land uses in the Project area including Natural, Recreational, and Scenic Areas and Public or Conservation Land.</p>

OSH 6 - Andreoli, J.; Arlotta, M.; Attardo, P.; Benioff, M.; Benioff, R.; Bound Jr, R.; Brosky, A.; Bydalek, M.; Crown, L.; Etheridge, C.; Fara, L.; Forcina, V.; Garay, M.; Gore, H.; Grillo, J.; Haberle, H.; Hamill, J.; Harr, K.; Harris, F.; Huebner, L.; Kelleher, S.; Kippel, P.; Kydd, S.; Lewine, S.; Loria, D.; Marshall, A.; Martin, J.; Mcgrath, S.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Miller, G.; Mills, A.; Mirsky, L.; O'brien, B.; Oleksa, D.; Pansi, M.; Phoneix, S.; Raichel, D.; Roggie, J.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Shedd, D.; Smith, H.; Spolar, T.; Synchron, M.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Wang, J.; Weisgerber, E.; Zuzov, J.; Harris, R.; Orben, J.; Hertzog, K.; Cronheim, P.; Eisinger, S.; Harris, R.; Midas, T.; Midas, M.; Romano, R.; Orben, J.; McVeigh, G.; Pichel, K.; Anderson, A.; Byrom, R.; Mergentime, A.; Grady, H.; Rasmussen, W.

Agricultural Lands

- Impacts to prime top soil
- Soil contamination
- Crop yields
- Organic farming

On any pipeline ROW, proper restoration will be required and monitored throughout the construction and restoration process. After construction, the ROW will be regraded, seeded, and temporary erosion control devices will be installed, according to laws, regulations and improved BMPs. As a BMP for farming, when the ROW is prepared for construction, any topsoil that is present is carefully stripped off the top and stockpiled on the edge of the ROW, separate from any excavated subsoil. Once pipeline construction is completed, the topsoil will be returned to the ROW and restored to the original grade. Farming activities can resume as they did before construction and yields should not be materially affected in the long term.

PennEast will employ third party environmental inspectors to monitor all construction and restoration activities to maintain compliance with all E&S plans, FERC Order conditions, other environmental permits and approvals and environmental requirements in landowner easement agreements.

According to USDA organic regulations (7CFR §205), which includes all USDA organic standards, including prohibited practices and requirements, pipeline infrastructure is not listed as affecting the certification of organic agriculture.

PennEast will work with farmers to measure both pre- and post-construction crop yields until such time as yields have reached pre-construction levels. PennEast will compensate farmers for impacts to crop yields caused by the Project and will work diligently to eliminate the impact. Agricultural lands will be restored using approved, modern mitigation techniques designed to reestablish pre-existing productive use of the agricultural lands, which is typically within 3 years following Project completion.

OSH 7 - Arlotta, M.; Armocida, F.; Attardo, P.; Badman, A.; Balogh, E.; Brosky, A.; Bydalek, M.; Clark, P.; Cleveland, L.; Collins, K.; Crombie, A.; Crown, L.; Deremer, F.; Diaz, I.; Etheridge, C.; Fara, L.; Fink, C.; Greeny, A.; Haberle, H.; Hinesley, G.; Huebner, L.; Hutter, F.; Kelleher, S.; Kippel, P.; Larore, D.; Lindall, C.; Loria, D.; Lowry, L.; Martin, L.; Mcgurdy, N.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Miller, G.; Mills, A.; Neary, C.; Oddo, C.; Pansi, M.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Raichel, D.; Rodriguez, A.; Safer, R.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Shedd, D.; Smith, H.; Spence, J.; Spolar, T.; Student II, J.; Synchron, M.; Tiscio, L.; Wang, J.; Zaleabos, M.; Zapatha, B.; Zuzov, J.; Fazekas, T.; Simko, S.; Harris, R.; Hertzog, K.; Dubiel, M.; Germanoski, D.; Likowski, R.; Metz, R.; Panuski, A.; Hawk, D.

Erosion and Sedimentation

- Potential impacts to runoff/soil compaction
- Flooding
- Drainage patterns

PennEast has used the siting process to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies. Prior to construction, PennEast will be required to submit detailed erosion and sediment control (E&S) plans to both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey DEPs or county conservation districts. Upon approval, PennEast will employ related BMPs during construction to prevent erosion in accordance with the approved plans, as well as applicable regulations and permits. After restoration, PennEast is responsible for maintaining the permanent rights-of-way (ROW) while the pipeline remains in operation. Federal and state regulatory agencies will inspect and monitor the area to maintain compliance with all regulations and permits.

Construction plans for the Project will be permitted through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and reviewed or approved by the state DEPs, conservation districts, and River Basin Commissions. PennEast will employ approved BMPs during pipeline construction with the appropriate environmental controls in place. These BMPs will be inspected on a daily basis during construction by environmental inspectors as well as periodically by agency and FERC third-party inspectors.

PennEast's E&S and Site Restoration Plan will be included in its FERC application as Appendix E.

OSH 8 - Aliciene, J.; Anderson, A.; Anderson, N.; Arlotta, M.; Attardo, P.; Ayers, T.; Balogh, E.; Barry, J.; Bell, J.; Bereswill, J.; Bound Jr, R.; Brosky, A.; Cantor, G.; Chandler, M.; Collins, K.; Coss, A.; Crofts, B.; Crown, J.; Crown, L.; Deaver, K.; Dejesus, M.; Demena, D.; Diaz, I.; Druffel, K.; Ecker, T.; Elinich, D.; Evans, L.; Evans, P.; Fink, C.; Gochko, E.; Grillo, J.; Hanson, A.; Harr, K.; Harrington, C.; Homeyer, C.; Howell, M.; Janiszewski, D.; Joseph Ceadar Family Memorial Trust; Kelleher, S.; Kullick, R.; Lee, B.; Lewine, S.; Littleton, T.; Lombardo, D.; Longoski, M.; M, E.; Macy, C.; Marshall, A.; Martin, C.; Martin, J.; Martin, L.; Meacham, S.; Mehta, A.; Mershon, J.; Miller, G.; Mortan, A.; Neary, C.; Nichols, J.; Nini, D.; O'Brien, B.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Pressel, M.; Pritchard, L.; Ravipinto, F.; Rawley, M.; Rawlins, R.; Robinson, K.; Roggie, J.; Rothman, R.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schmidt, E.; Schmidt, M.; Schwartz, D.; Shepherd, R.; Slatkin, D.; Spence, J.; Spolar, T.; Strock, A.; Syrnick, M.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Thall, L.; Tiscio, L.; Waibel, A.; Zapatha, B.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; Anderson, A.; Ayers, T.; Cordaro, N.; Cordaro, V.; Goetz, W.; Hricak, G.; Martin, T.; McVeigh, G.; Roedell, E.; Simko, S.; Zrinski, T.; Bilby, A.; Dymond, R.; Elinich, A.; Ely, C.; Hippaul, D.; Hochenberger, K.; Kellner, W.; Kovitch, R.; McClennan, R.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; O'Shea, F.; Thomas, K.; Traver, S.; U Lous Dal Santo Trust.; Wilson, N.; Wolferman, S.; Cronheim, P.; Maher, S.; deMena, D.; Evans, P.; Goetz, W.; Martin, T.; Ayers, T.; Guest, J.; Hertzog, K.; McVeigh, G.; Evans, P.; Traver, S.; Panuski, A.; Panuski, A.; Rodriguez, A.; Kovitch, R.; Gibson, B.; Ayers, T.; Grady, H.; Anderson, D.

Health and Safety

- Potential for pipeline leaks, methane release
- Pipeline proximity to schools

PennEast will comply with the pipeline safety standards established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) (49 CFR §190-199). Pipelines are the safest, most environmentally-friendly and efficient mode of transporting energy, according to PHMSA. Data shows that while natural gas demand has increased, serious pipeline incidents have decreased by 90 percent over the past three decades alone, primarily as a result of significant efforts by pipeline companies to upgrade and modernize their infrastructure. Transportation by pipeline is the safest mode of transportation.

Safety is PennEast's highest priority when designing pipelines. PennEast adopts design features and operating practices that meet or exceed stringent industry and regulatory standards. PennEast will regularly walk the PennEast Pipeline, conduct leak surveys and send sensor equipment through the line to make sure integrity has not been compromised. PennEast will continuously monitor (24/7/365) how much gas is transported through the system, operating pressures and temperatures throughout the system, and other critical operating data. This is done in real-time through our gas control center. Should any unusual data surface, PennEast will immediately dispatch field personnel to address the issue and protect the community. Additionally, the pipeline will be clearly marked at all road crossings, creeks, property lines, and fence lines to minimize the potential for third-party damage. PennEast will be a member of the national 1-Call system (Dial 811) that requires anyone performing excavations to call 3 days prior so that the line can be located and marked in the area of excavation.

Local emergency response and management personnel will receive emergency response training prior to the Project being placed into service and on an ongoing basis thereafter. Necessary information and instructions regarding the facilities will be provided to local emergency response and management personnel. A plan will be in place for coordination between PennEast and local emergency response and management personnel in the event of an incident.

PennEast is designing the Project to exceed federal safety regulations in many important areas, including:

- The pipe material will meet and generally exceed the API-5L requirements;
- Class 2 pipe will be installed in all Class 1 locations in order to increase safety factors;
- 100 percent nondestructive inspection of mainline welds (for example 49 CFR 192 requires only 10 percent of the welds to be tested in Class 1 locations); and
- Prior to placing the line into service, the pipe will be hydrostatically tested at a maximum pressure that will exceed industry standards identified in 49 CFR 192.

The high grade steel utilized in the manufacture of the pipeline makes pipe deterioration less of a concern for projects such as PennEast. No pesticides will be used in the maintenance of the pipeline ROW.

Resource Report 11 – Reliability and Safety will evaluate the overall safety of the Project through construction and pipeline operation and presents the extensive safety measures, emergency procedures, and oversight that will be adopted and implemented for the Project.

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 9 - Adler, B.; Anderson, A.; Anderson, N.; Arlotta, M.; Badman, A.; Balogh, E.; Barry, J.; Collins, K.; Crombie, A.; Demena, D.; Evans, P.; Fara, L.; Fink, C.; Harbin, W.; Haynes-Johnson, D.; Hotz, J.; Hutter, F.; Karas, D.; Kippel, P.; Larore, D.; Lindall, C.; Mcgurty, N.; Meacham, S.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Mirsky, L.; Neary, C.; Oddo, C.; Pansi, M.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Pope, S.; Pritchard, L.; Roggie, J.; Sauter, L.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schmidt, E.; Shepherd, R.; Slatkin, D.; Student II, J.; Taylor, C.; Winston, D.; Zapatha, B.; Zuzov, J.; Anderson, A.; Christensen, D.; deMena, D.; Evans, P.; Germanoski, D.; Gordon, C.; Hotz, J.; Orben, J.; Harbin, W.; Ayers, T.; Christensen, D.; Gibson, B.</p>	<p>Geologic Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limestone and dolomite formations • Karst • Sinkholes • Earthquakes • Fault zones • Ramapo fault line 	<p>The high grade steel to be used to manufacture the pipeline will minimize sinkhole risks. Piping, such as that planned for the Project, can withstand loss of subgrade support of over 100 feet in length without being compromised. Should a sinkhole occur, PennEast would immediately address the situation by properly shoring the pipeline.</p> <p>PennEast has conducted a Seismic Hazard Analysis for the pipeline, including along the Ramapo fault zone in New Jersey. Initial results of the analysis found that the probability of surface fault hazard to the pipeline was deemed well below the probabilities considered for engineering design and therefore insignificant.</p> <p>As part of its environmental analysis PennEast is evaluating potential geologic hazards including seismic risk, active faults, soil liquefaction, landslides and steep/side slopes, karst topography/land subsidence, and flash flooding. A complete analysis of the geology in the Project area will be presented in Resource Report 6 – Geology.</p>
<p>OSH 10 - Bilby, D.; Bordwick, P.; Deleon, P.; Evans, P.; Garay, M.; Gochko, E.; Hotz, J.; Kavanaugh, K.; Keith, C.; Longoski, M.; Martin, L.; O'Brien, B.; Pritchard, L.; Raichel, D.; Ramos, J.; Reed, K.; Robbins, J.; Roggie, J.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schrandt, H.; Sheetz, R.; Slatkin, D.; Syrnick, M.; Venini, M.; Washburn, D.; Washburn, W.; Yeash, L.; Zrinski, T.; Evans, P.; Bilby, A.; Panuski, A.; Rodriguez, A.; Garofalini, S.; Hertzog, K.; Evans, P.; Kratzer, D.; Connor, D.</p>	<p>Blasting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby quarries 	<p>To the extent where bedrock is encountered, PennEast would first attempt to use mechanical methods such as excavation or ripping to remove bedrock, where practicable. Blasting will be employed if other methods cannot successfully remove rock to the appropriate depth. Blasting is done in compliance with all applicable permits and regulations. PennEast will implement a project blasting plan that will provide specific procedures, safety measures, notification processes, and other required protocols that will be employed during blasting activities while utilizing only licensed and qualified contractors. Proper notifications to surrounding landowners will be provided well in advance of any potential blasting.</p> <p>Today, the use of blasting is a very controlled and minimally impactful method to extract rock in many construction projects from single site development to linear projects such as pipelines. Current blasting techniques for pipeline construction use very carefully placed charges that are positioned in a manner to control the direction and velocity of the blast. Modeling is used to assess the pattern and distance of the blasting. Following construction a supplemental inspection will be conducted.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 11 - Anderson, N.; Balogh, E.; Canright, M.; Cantor, G.; Crombie, A.; Etheridge, C.; Grillo, J.; Hanson, A.; Harbin, W.; Harris, F.; Hencheck, B.; Hencheck, J.; Hotz, J.; Hutter, F.; Macy, C.; Martin, C.; Mirsky, L.; Oleksa, D.; Oleksa, L.; Pressel, M.; Pritchard, L.; Richard, A.; Robinson, K.; Rodriguez, A.; Roggie, J.; Slata, G.; Slatkin, D.; Steele, J.; Syrnick, M.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Cronheim, P.; Fazekas, T.; Harbin, W.; Harris, R.; Huff, R.; Kovitch, R.; Rodriguez, A.; Werkheiser, F.; White, G.; Kratzer, D.; Gibson, B.; Guilmartin, K.; Byrom, R.; Mergentime, A.; Rasmussen, W.; Pritchard, L.; Hutter, F.</p>	<p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandy Ridge Church and Cemetery • Lenape artifacts • Infringement on Native Peoples' historic sites • Rockhopper Trail, "The Road Along the Rocks" • Potter's Field (burial area) • Delaware Canal State Park • Pursely's Ferry • Crossroads of the American • Revolution National Heritage Area • Swetland Homestead • Rosemont Rural Agricultural District • Durham/Cooks Creek Heritage Area • Isaac Stout House • Jacob Arndt House • Coffeetown Grist Mill 	<p>In developing the proposed route for the pipeline, PennEast considered potential impacts to culturally sensitive areas, including historic buildings. During the permitting process, PennEast will consult with the various state and federal agencies that oversee these areas and work with them and landowners to avoid or minimize impacts to culturally sensitive areas.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, PennEast will identify cultural resources within the Project's area of potential effect (APE) and make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places to FERC and the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (54 U.S.C. 306108). PennEast is making extensive efforts to avoid cultural resources during the siting process.</p> <p>PennEast has contacted members of fifteen federally recognized Native American tribes to determine concerns with the Project. A number of tribes have responded with determinations of 'No Effect' from the proposed project.</p> <p>Section 4.5 of Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources will present the results of cultural resource investigations in the Project's APE and provides avoidance and mitigation measures adopted by the Project.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 12 - Andreoli, J.; Arlotta, M.; Attardo, P.; Ayers, T.; Balogh, E.; Brosky, A.; Cantor, G.; Chandler, M.; Conroy, J.; Coss, A.; Crown, L.; Deaver, K.; Dejesus, M.; Demena, D.; Druffel, K.; Elinich, D.; Etheridge, C.; Evans, L.; Evans, P.; Feinberg, J.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Ferrino, R.; Gentry, C.; Hanson, A.; Harrington, C.; Hotz, J.; Howell, M.; Hughes, W.; Keith, C.; Lombardo, D.; Lombardo, R.; Marshall, A.; Martin, J.; Martinkovic, J.; McDougald Jr, F.; Meacham, S.; Mehta, A.; Mershon, J.; Miller, G.; Neary, C.; Omelia, E.; Pressel, M.; Pritchard, L.; Robbins, J.; Robinson, K.; Roggie, J.; Sauter, L.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schaible, J.; Slotter, C.; Sobreyra, A.; Soloman, N.; Synchronick, M.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Thall, L.; Theodorson, D.; Thompson, E.; Tomczak, B.; Vassallo, A.; Waverka, F.; Weisgerber, E.; Winston, D.; Young, M.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; Ayers, T.; Christensen, D.; Cronheim, P.; deMena, D.; Fazekas, T.; Guest, J.; Opathof, L.; Opathof, M.; Rusinski, R.; Zakutansky, M.; Eisinger, S.; Likowski, R.; Martin, T.; Midas, M.; Midas, T.; Pichel, K.; Scott, J.; Thomas, K.; Kratzer, D.; Gibson, B.; Collins, K.; Zaino, A.</p>	<p>Socioeconomics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax/economic benefits • Tourism • Traffic 	<p>There are millions of miles of pipelines throughout the country and, thus, there are a considerable number of properties near pipelines. A report by Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc., which was prepared in 2001 for the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, Inc., evaluated the impact of natural gas pipelines on real estate in four separate and geographically diverse areas, including two suburban areas and two rural areas crossed by one to multiple natural gas pipelines. The study concluded that there was no significant impact on property sales located along natural gas pipelines due to the pipeline size or the product carried. Additionally, other studies have reached similar conclusions: PGP Valuation Inc. (2008) for Palomar Gas Transmission Inc.; Ecowest (Fruits, 2008) for the Oregon LNG Project; Diskin, Friedman, Peppas, and Peppas (2011); and Hansen et al. (2006).</p> <p>The National Association of Insurance Commissioners provides a consumer guide on homeowners insurance, which does not indicate that the presence of utilities is a factor in considering in obtaining or maintaining an insurance policy (NAIC, 2010).</p> <p>According to an Economic Impact Analysis prepared by Econsult Solutions and Drexel University School of Economics, the Project will have a substantial positive economic impact on Pennsylvania and New Jersey residents, commercial businesses, industrial production plants and power generation. The benefits include 12,160 supported jobs with a labor income of \$740 million during the construction of the Project and 98 supported jobs with a labor income of \$8.3 million throughout the ongoing operations (Econsult and Drexel University, 2015).</p> <p>Tourism is significant contributor to the economies within the Project area. The effects on outdoor recreation areas, a main tourist attraction throughout the Project area, will be minimized through co-location and agency coordination, lessening the overall impact of the Project on tourism.</p> <p>The construction of major road crossings and most high-volume state and local road crossings will be accomplished using conventional boring techniques, such as horizontal direction drilling. This is done specifically to minimize disturbance to existing roadways and decrease the effect on traffic patterns.</p> <p>Resource Report 5 – Socioeconomics will evaluate existing socioeconomic conditions in the Project area including agricultural and timber production, tourism, housing, land acquisition, public services and facilities, taxes and revenue, transportation, and environmental justice.</p>
<p>OSH 13 - Attardo, P.; Barry, J.; Cantor, G.; Conroy, J.; Crown, L.; D'agostino, D.; Deaver, K.; Dejesus, M.; Druffel, K.; Evans, L.; Ferrino, R.; Hanson, A.; Harrington, S.; Hughes, W.; Keith, C.; Kullick, R.; Lewis, N.; Lombardo, D.; MacClay, C.; Marshall, A.; Nalesnik, E.; Nichols, J.; Thall, L.; Tiscio, L.; Waibel, A.; Waverka, F.; William, R.; Cronheim, P.; Bilby, A.; Scott, J.; Kohut, D.; Gibson, B.</p>	<p>Noise Quality</p>	<p>Noise impacts associated with the Project will be limited so that the Project will meet all applicable regulatory requirements. A complete evaluation of existing conditions as pertaining to noise in the Project area, as well as mitigation measures that will be adopted for the Project will be included in PennEast's environmental analysis as Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
<p>OSH 14 - Aucott, M.; Bordwick, P.; Deleon, P.; Eckel, C.; Eckel, R.; Elinich, M.; Evans, P.; Garay, M.; Gochko, E.; Hedrick, D.; Hedrick, T.; Hotz, J.; Kavanaugh, K.; Keith, C.; Lawver, J.; Martin, L.; O'Brien, B.; Pritchard, L.; Raichel, D.; Ramos, J.; Reed, K.; Robbins, J.; Roggie, J.; Schafer Rissmiller, B.; Schrandt, H.; Schwartz, D.; Sheetz, R.; Slatkin, D.; Syrnick, M.; Venini, M.; Yeash, L.; Young, M.; Zrinski, T.; Cronheim, P.; Cordaro, N.; Cordaro, V.; Zrinski, T.; Reuscher, C.; Maher, S.; Harris, R.; Ayers, T.; Hricak, G.; Opathof, L.; Opathof, M.; Rusinski, R.</p>	<p>Alternatives Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-pipeline alternative • No Action Alternative • Systems Alternative • Alternative Energy Alternative 	<p>Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.</p> <p>Resource Report 10 – Alternatives provides a detailed analysis regarding the routing of the PennEast Pipeline and an evaluation of alternatives to the Project.</p>
<p>OSH 15 - Aucott, M.; Benioff, M.; Benioff, R.; Bordelon, C.; Brosky, A.; Crown, L.; Diaz, I.; Elinich, D.; Evans, P.; Fara, L.; Fernando-Mehta, G.; Fraser, L.; Garay, M.; Gentry, C.; Gochko, E.; Greeny, A.; Harris, F.; Hotz, J.; Joseph Ceadar Family Memorial Trust; Kippel, P.; Larore, D.; Lee, B.; Martinkovic, J.; McDevitt, J.; McGee, J.; McGurty, N.; Mershon, J.; Meuser, H.; Meuser, J.; Mirsky, L.; Pansi, M.; Patterson, D.; Patterson, J.; Pope, S.; Pressel, M.; Pritchard, L.; Ramos, J.; Roggie, J.; Schaible, J.; Schmidt, E.; Slatkin, D.; Student II, J.; Syrnick, M.; Tai, H.; Taylor, C.; Taylor, R.; Weisgerber, E.; Yeash, L.; Zrinski, T.; Zuzov, J.; N.; Stanek, T.; Bummer, A.; Davis, L.; DiGrazia, K.; DiGrazia, V.; Majer, C.; Robinson, K.; Fox, J.; Byrom, R.; Mergentime, A.; Hibbs, J.; Rasmussen, W.</p>	<p>Purpose and Need</p>	<p>Section of 1.1 of Resource Report 1 – General Project Description details the purpose and need of the PennEast Pipeline.</p>
<p>OSH 16 - Hanson, A.; Moore, B.; Weidel, R.</p>	<p>Safety concerns with co-locating with existing transmission line ROWs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical circuit between pipeline and electric transmission lines 	<p>Standard safety practices for installation of a pipeline near a power line will be utilized during construction to ensure safety of all personnel. These safety measures include such things as training and daily safety “tailgate” discussions, static straps on vehicles, grounding of pipe strung along the ROW, utilization of safety spotters, etc.</p> <p>In addition to safety during construction, a detailed engineering review will be conducted to design mitigation measures in areas where the pipeline and power lines cross or parallel to alleviate static buildup on the pipeline. The installation of these AC mitigation measures is commonly used by all pipeline operators to ensure the safe operation of pipelines that are in close proximity to electric transmission facilities.</p>
<p>OSH 17 - Hanson, A.; Sauer, L.; Roedell, E.; Church, T.; Gallagher, S.; Pichel, K.</p>	<p>FERC Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly prepared EIS 	<p>FERC is managing the preparation of a Third-Party EIS in accordance with applicable Federal regulations and requirements.</p>

Stakeholder	Issue of Concern	Found In/ Status
OSH 18 - Hanson, A.	ROW maintenance procedures	For the portions of the permanent ROW that are not farmed, PennEast will perform routine maintenance on the ROW such as mowing and tree clearing. Areas that wash, subside or are damaged due to natural causes will be maintained and repairs will be performed by PennEast.
OSH 19 -	Insurance for Pipeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowners • Businesses 	<p>With respect to homeowner's insurance, any claim that a homeowner would either be unable to obtain insurance or that premiums would increase as a result of a pipeline on their property has not been substantiated. According to a U.S. Energy Information Administration report, in 2008, there were over 300,000 miles of natural gas pipelines in the lower 48 states. Pipelines have co-existed with residential property for many years, and PennEast is unaware of insurance underwriters refusing to issue homeowner's insurance due to the presence of a natural gas pipeline. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has a consumer guide in homeowner's insurance that can be found at www.naic.org. In no place is there any question of utilities being a factor in obtaining or maintaining an insurance policy.</p> <p>With respect to liability insurance, PennEast will be insured with sufficient types and amounts of insurance commensurate with similarly sized companies, with similar types of assets, to appropriately respond to any pipeline incident. Further, PennEast will require its subcontractors to maintain appropriate types and amounts of insurance commensurate with their respective construction responsibilities. These coverages will extend to landowners from the start of the survey process through the lifetime of the pipeline.</p>

Diskin, Barry A., Jack P. Friedman, Spero C. Peppas, Stephanie R. Peppas. 2011. The Effect of Natural Gas Pipelines on Residential Value. International Right of Way Online Journal. Available at: http://www.irwaonline.org/eweb/upload/web_jan_NaturalGas.pdf. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

Econsult Solutions and Drexel University. 2015. Economic Impact Report and Analysis: PennEast Pipeline Project Economic Impact Analysis. Available at: <http://penneastpipeline.com/economic-impact-analysis/>. Accessed on February 17, 2015.

Fruits, Eric. 2008. Natural Gas Pipelines and Residential Property Values: Evidence from Clackamas and Washington Counties. *ECONorthwest*. February 20, 2008.

Interstate Natural Gas Association of America Foundation (INGAA). 2001. Natural Gas Pipeline Impact Study. <http://www.ingaa.org/Foundation/Studies/FoundationReports/207.aspx>. Accessed on January 30, 2015.

National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). 2010. A Consumer's Guide to Home Insurance. Available at: http://www.naic.org/documents/consumer_guide_home.pdf. Accessed on February 19, 2015.

7CFR§205. 2015. National Organic Program. Available online at: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/7/part-205>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

15 U.S.C. §717f. 2015. Natural Gas Act of 1938. Section 7: Construction, extension, or abandonment of facilities. Available online at: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/chapter-15B>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

49CFR §190-199. 2015. Pipeline Safety Regulations. Available online at: <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/SafetyStandards.htm>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.

54 U.S.C. 306108. 2015. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). Section 106: Regulations. Available online at: <http://www.achp.gov/106summary.html>. Accessed on 3/10/2015.