Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Atlantic Sunrise Project, Docket No. CP15-138

Dear FERC Commissioners,

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is charged with making a decision whether to allow the Atlantic Sunrise project to proceed. As proposed, the Atlantic Sunrise project will cross 190 miles and impact nearly 4000 acres of land in Pennsylvania. As a public official in Pennsylvania, I am concerned that the environmental impact statement upon which you are being asked to review and on which you must base a decision is flawed and incomplete. Many commenters, including several governmental agencies, have highlighted these problems.

In a letter dated June 27, 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requested FERC to take a closer look at project alternatives for the Atlantic Sunrise pipeline project. The EPA recommended that FERC consider two system alternatives for further study that were presented, but not fully examined in the commission's draft environmental impact statement. These alternatives could minimize environmental impacts while accomplishing the project's goal.

One of the suggested alternatives involves co-location of approximately 91% of the project's route with the existing Transco system, while the other would involve the PennEast Pipeline Co. LLC pipeline. Either of these alternatives could ultimately eliminate the need for the Atlantic Sunrise project. "The alternatives analysis presented in the DEIS seems to include reasonable alternatives which were not carried forward for detailed consideration," the EPA wrote.

EPA noted its concern over direct, secondary and cumulative impacts to aquatic resources,

groundwater, and water quality. Aquatic resources have the potential to be impacted by many

activities, including waterbody crossings, clearing, blasting, and water withdraws for hydrostatic

testing. Some of the resources within the project are high quality and sensitive resources,

including Exceptional Value (EV) and trout streams. EPA asked that the full assessment of these

simultaneously occurring impacts to resources be conducted.

In addition, EPA is concerned about the amount of detailed information that has yet to be filed and is

not evaluated in the DEIS. "This includes surveys for land, rare species, historic resources, water

supplies, air modeling, mitigation measures to manage and dispose of contaminated

groundwater, proposed mitigation measures for source water protection areas, geotechnical

feasibility studies for HOD crossing locations and mitigation measures to minimize drilling risks,

and a detailed aquatic resource compensatory mitigation plan. This information is relevant and

critical to evaluation of potential impacts." The information is not in the public record for the public to review.

In a letter dated July 8, 2016, the US Department of the Interior, as trustee for national parks and national historic places, flagged glaring inadequacies in the draft environmental impact statement:

The DEIS fails to assess the cumulative impacts, “the incremental effects of a proposed action

when added to impacts associated with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects,

regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions” (DEIS, pg. 4-258) for the

Appalachian National Scenic Trail, despite its identification as a long, linear recreational and

special interest resource of national significance that would be impacted by the proposed project,

and by many of the projects listed in Appendix P. Cumulative impacts to the Captain John Smith

Chesapeake NHT are also missing from the analysis of cumulative impacts despite the similar

attributes it shares with the AT, specifically a long, linear recreational and special interest

resource of national significance. Many of the projects listed in Appendix P are known or

proposed to cross each of these trails. . . . The cumulative impacts analysis should be significantly revised in order to adequately disclose the cumulative impacts to these important national resources. NPS can provide assistance in this endeavor. .. . The impact of the multitude of threats to the cultural resources of each trail must be analyzed and disclosed in order to assess the potential cumulative impacts to these important historic and cultural resources.

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection noted in letter to FERC, dated June 27, 2016, that the draft environmental impact statement " does not fully acknowledge the State law requirements that Transco must fulfill to meet its obligations under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1341)." It continues: " While these State law authorizations are identified in the draft EIS, FERC does not expressly require Transco to obtain these State law authorizations prior to construction." DEP describes "FERC's short-hand method" of describing Pennsylvania's State Water Quality Certification and its State law permits required thereunder as permits issued under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act as "misleading" and asks that it be corrected to accurately describe these

requirements as applicable State law authorizations. Due to these defects, the DEIS identifies numerous instances in which Transco needs to provide additional information to FERC prior to the end of the draft EIS comment period or prior to construction.

In a letter filed with FERC on July 11, 2016, the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources noted that the Atlantic Sunrise project could impact lands purchased by the Commonwealth with funds from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. These include state game lands, state park land, state forest land, and county land. DCNR warned: "Any change in use or transfer of rights (including, but not limited to, pipeline easements/right-of-way agreements) of any DCNR funded property (via state grants or federal grants) may constitute a conversion." FERC should be fully aware of the legal impediments along the proposed pipeline route.

Governmental agencies do not raise concerns lightly. The problems identified by other governmental agencies are significant and widespread. I ask that the problems identified be resolved by issuing a supplemental environmental impact statement before you move forward on this project.