

WITHDRAW DEIS SAMPLE COMMENT

Honorable Norman Bay, Chair
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket CP15-558 / PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Chairman Bay and Members of FERC:

My name is XXXXXX, I am an intervenor and impacted landowner regarding docket CP15-558 for the PennEast pipeline. I live in the town of XXXXX, NJ. I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I urge you and all the members of FERC to reconsider your issuance of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement at this time and withdraw the DEIS. Mandate that your agency receive all the necessary factual data to evaluate this project BEFORE reaching any conclusions about its viability or advisability. For the past two years, my life and the lives of my neighbors, my community and our regional area of western New Jersey and Pennsylvania have been in upheaval based upon the invasion of the PennEast pipeline project proposal into our region.

How can you decide at this juncture that this project should move forward when there are so many aspects of this project where the investigations into mandatory components of the project are still “ongoing”? (Example: wetlands surveys, endangered species surveys, etc.) How is this good faith and due diligence by the government agency charged with giving this a fair review?

I respectfully ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS, demand the actual field survey data in all required areas and actually listen to the many diverse yet unified voices impacted by this destructive project.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

AND....

NO ADEQUATE ALTERNATIVES Comment Sample

My name is XXXXXX, I am an intervenor and impacted landowner regarding docket CP15-558 for the PennEast pipeline. I live in the town of West Amwell, NJ. I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The "No-Action" alternative in the DEIS is overly narrow, has no citations of fact, and does not conform to NEPA regulations and precedents. In fact, the No-Action alternative is a bare four paragraphs in length. The only "fact" referenced is the existence and names of the shippers on the project. And no other facts or citations are offered to back up any of the assertions there in.

In fact the No-Action alternative is nothing but empty rhetoric. This does not constitute the "hard look" that NEPA calls for. This is empty boilerplate with no substance. This DEIS should be withdrawn by FERC, and not offered again until it actually satisfies NEPA and truly takes a "hard look" at all aspects of the project, including the No-Action Alternative.