

Chairman, Norman C. Bay
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Suite 11A
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Docket No. CP15-558-000 - PennEast Pipeline Draft EIS

In PennEast's Third Supplemental Response to November 24, 2015 Data Request of PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC under CP15-558 (**Accession Number:** 20160805-5228), PennEast submitted a **Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan** dated August 3, 2016. The plan, 8 pages of content and 4 pages of empty appendices, states in Section 4 "Post-Construction" that:

"PennEast is currently communicating and will continue to communicate with the appropriate agencies and individuals at the state, county, municipal, community, and private levels regarding road construction and post-construction restoration for public and private road crossings."

and further it states in Section 5 "Stakeholder Consultation" that:

"All consultations for roadways crossed by the proposed Project will be initiated by Land Agents subcontracted to and representing PennEast. The land agents will build a working relationship with the Municipalities and Agencies through face to face meetings, phone calls, and email correspondence. This approach will allow for the Land Agents to function as a point of contact for the project and stakeholders, while also being able to gather information, permitting design requirements, and the forms necessary to complete the roadway occupancy and driveway permit applications.

The Land Agents will also provide any applicable information on the Project and respond to questions posed from the road owners / stakeholders (e.g. Road Masters, Township officials, State officials) to ensure the proposed crossing designs conform to all best practices and local design codes and standards. All interactions and communications will be documented in Contact Reports. To date, there have been ongoing communication through the PennEast land agents and the state, county, and local roadway stakeholders."

As an elected municipal official, I find this statement misleading at best. We have no "working relationship" or ongoing "communication" with any of PennEast's land agents other than complaints of trespassing we have received from local residents. They occasionally inform us that they may be in the area. To construe that the relationship is anything more than informational only would not be factual.

The materials that PennEast is calling its **Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan** is not a plan at all. It gives no specifics as to how the proposed project will impact specific municipalities. The DEIS continues to incorrectly label roads. It does not account for "Access Roads" that are utilized by homeowners as the sole method of getting to their homes. In Kingwood Township, many driveways are over two tenths of a mile or longer, this plan makes no allowance for them. There is no allowance for priority traffic such as school busses and emergency vehicles. There are no time schedules for construction traffic proposed. There is not even the mention of a prohibition of on street parking which is the norm in most, if not all of our rural communities.

Chairman Bay, this submission is not a plan and should not be accepted as such. Given the number of gaps in data and omissions, required to construct a safe pipeline with no or minimal impacts to the communities it passes through, I am requesting that the entire **Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan** be resubmitted at a time when these issues will have been resolved and any decision on the status of the pipeline project be held until that time.

The health, safety and welfare of our communities is too important to risk it for the monetary enhancement of a few individuals.

Sincerely,
Richard Dodds
Kingwood Township Committee

cc: Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary