

February 4, 2015

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

Re: Docket No. PF15-1-000 (PennEast Pipeline Project)

Secretary Bose:

On January 21st, we submitted a letter to you detailing the problems we identified with the scoping meetings for the proposed PennEast pipeline. Specifically, we noted problems with both the plans for the meetings and way the meetings were announced. We view these to be problems that must be addressed before the scoping process can move forward in a way that ensures that members of the public who wish to participate may do so. To that end, we called on you to extend the scoping period to 120 days.

The only response we received was a short note the same day from Ken Buckstrup, Director, System Operations, advising us that official submissions are not accepted via email and must be entered into the e-filing system. He also attached the notice issued that day extending the scoping period to February 27th and providing more specific details about the location of the meetings that had been scheduled. We submitted the letter into the system, also on January 21st.

Since then, we have received no response from the Commission and, with the exception of the additional meeting location detail, consider the issues we brought to your attention to remain unresolved. In addition, more problems have arisen that must be addressed.

Our new concerns are as follows:

- Inadequate notice of meeting cancellations – FERC cancelled the first two scheduled scoping meetings. The reason given was “unforeseen” circumstances. The press was later told that weather forecasts caused the meetings to be cancelled. The first meeting was cancelled on the Friday afternoon prior to the meeting scheduled for the following Tuesday. The second meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, was cancelled on Monday. In neither case did the Commission contact the local press to announce the cancellation or publish a notice. In both cases, we contacted the press to inform them and were told that they had not received any word from you. If you considered potential travel conditions to be dangerous enough to warrant cancelling the meetings, then we find it unacceptable that you made no effort to safeguard the public by letting them know. It is especially unacceptable in light of the fact that we noted in our original letter (see the second and third bullet points in the list below) that the meeting locations you selected were going to cause some participants to drive at least 40 miles to attend them and that the start time of 6 p.m. meant they’d be making that drive in rush hour.

- Disenfranchisement – It is entirely possible that people travelled to the meetings not knowing they were cancelled only to find out that they’d made the trip for no reason. We are concerned that people in that situation may have been so frustrated by it that they will not attend other scheduled or rescheduled meetings.
- Rescheduling of meetings – The cancellation stated, “Once a new venue is established and scheduled, the Commission will issue another notice advising of the new location and time.” It does not indicate if the rescheduled meeting will be held in the same general vicinity or if it could be moved to another part of the state. A request has been submitted for a scoping meeting to be held in Hunterdon County. We don’t know if that request will be granted and if that meeting will replace the only NJ meeting originally scheduled or if it will be added to the schedule.

•

We know from press reports that FERC spokeswoman Tamara Young-Allen confirmed receipt of a letter from Congressman Leonard Lance calling for the Hunterdon County meeting and indicated that she expected Chairwoman LaFleur to respond. No such consideration has been given to our letter sent days before Congressman Lance’s letter.

The concerns we originally raised are as follows:

- Inadequate number of meetings – FERC should schedule more than five meetings and hold multiple meetings in New Jersey.
- Location of meetings – FERC should schedule meetings in the areas impacted by the pipeline. The meeting locations announced are not convenient. In some cases, the nearest meeting is 40 miles away.
- Timing of meetings – FERC should start the meetings at 7 p.m. Starting meetings at 6 p.m. will make it difficult for people who have to travel up to 40 miles to attend to make it there safely after work.
- Size of venue – FERC should hold meeting rooms that hold at least 200 people, as many members of the public want to stay at the meeting to hear others’ comments.
- Accessibility of venue – FERC should make sure that the venues are accessible with adequate parking options for the disabled.
- Access to resources – FERC should provide the public with GIS map or shape files of all current routes under consideration. Without precise maps, the public is unable to thoroughly to identify all environmental concerns.

The following are our concerns with the announcement itself:

- Lack of notice – FERC should allow the public more time to prepare for and make arrangements to attend the meetings. The announcement was issued on January 13, 2015. The first of the meetings is scheduled for January 27, 2015, just over two weeks later.
- Little time to prepare - One day after the schedule was announced, on January 14th, PennEast released the first map of an alternate route it is considering. The

public does not have adequate time to research the potential environmental impacts of the route and prepare comments.

- Insufficient public notification – FERC should post public notices in affected communities’ local papers. Public notices have not appeared in the affected communities’ local papers. Public notices appeared repeatedly for the open houses PennEast hosted last fall.
- Confusion about who may attend – FERC should make it clear in public notices that the meetings are open to the public. As a result of the insufficient notice provided, a frequently asked question is whether or not the meetings are for the public or for affected landowners only.
- Addresses of locations missing – The announcement should clearly state where the meeting rooms are at each of the venues. Three of the planned locations are college campuses. No building or room numbers have been provided on the announcement. The public has no idea where to go when they arrive on campus and the suitability and accessibility of the venue is impossible to determine without buildings and room numbers (see above).
- Lack of alternate dates – FERC should provide alternate dates for each of the meetings since they are taking place during the winter when travel can be dangerous.

We once again call on you to cancel the rest of the scoping meetings originally scheduled and extend the scoping period to 120 days in order to satisfactorily address the growing list of issues we have identified. We ask that Chairwoman LaFleur show us the same courtesy that she shows our elected officials by responding to this letter promptly.

Sincerely,
350.org Bucks County
Berks Gas Truth
Concerned Citizens Against the Pipeline, Holland Township
Delaware Riverkeeper Network
Food & Water Watch
Gas Drilling Awareness Coalition
Hopewell Township Citizens Against the PennEast Pipeline
Kingwood Citizens Against PennEast Pipeline
NJ Sierra Club
Pipeline Safety Coalition
Sourland Conservancy
StopPennEast.org
Williams Township Citizens Against the Pipeline

CC: Senator Cory Booker
Senator Robert Menendez
Representative Bonnie Watson Coleman
Representative Leonard Lance

Senator Robert Casey

Senator Pat Toomey

Mr. Tony Cox, PennEast

Ms. Alisa Harris, PennEast

John L. Walsh, President and Chief Executive Officer, UGI Corporation