

**Attachment B**

**Tennessee's Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports,  
February 27, 2015; May 15, 2015; October 8, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank

**Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports 1 and 10,  
February 27, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>General Comment</b>				
1	For information noted as being filed at a later date or upon completion, provide an estimated date for submittal. Draft copies of all noted mitigation plans should be included in the Application when filed.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
2	Upon provision of the Environmental Construction Plans (ECPs), provide a summary table of how each State ECP differs from one another, and from the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Procedures).	A table listing the deviations from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC's") Plan and Procedures is included as an attachment to the October 8, 2015 Response to Comments matrix.	10/8 Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1b	N/A
3	Identify if odorization facilities would be constructed in conjunction with the Project facilities. If so, identify the locations where odorization equipment would be located and discuss any mitigation to reduce odors.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
4	Identify any additional delivery points and provide information on any associated metering and regulation facilities.	A description of all new delivery points is provided in Section 1.1.2.1, Pipeline Facilities. A description of all meter stations is provided in Section 1.1.2.2.2.	RR1, Section 1.1.2.1 RR1, Section 1.1.2.2.2	1-22 to 1-30 1-48 to 1-54
<b>Draft Resource Report 1</b>				
1	File alignment sheets as "privileged" that include landowner names above each parcel, or file a public version of the alignment sheets with tract numbers and provide a separate list of tract numbers with the landowner of the tract as "privileged".	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		
2	Update Table 1.0-1 and the associated text to reflect each facility by specific mileposts including compressor stations. Include the specific compressor station mileposts in Table 1.1-3. Milepost numbers should include an indicator identifying the pipeline segment (example MP SP1.0 = milepost Supply Path 1.0, etc.)	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
3	For each planned compressor station, provide a large scale (1:3,600 or greater) plot plan identifying the proposed engine/compressor units, buildings, piping and other equipment, site property line, and nearby noise-sensitive areas (such as residences, farms, or schools).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
4	In Section 1.1.2.1, clarify why certain pipelines or laterals have a maximum allowable operation pressure (MAOP) equal to the maximum operating pressure (MOP), and others are designed to have a MOP of approximately half of the MAOP.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	In Table 1.1-2, specify the distance between the existing and proposed permanent rights-of-way and indicate the potential for further overlap that would allow abutting of the permanent rights-of-way in the associated text. In addition, specify the maximum overlap of existing rights-of-way allowable by the law, as stated throughout Resource Report 1.	Tennessee is engaged in discussions with the power companies regarding co-location and the proposed overlapping of the Northeast Energy Direct Project permanent easements and temporary construction workspaces with that of existing powerline easements and these discussions are ongoing. Tennessee is currently conducting surveys of the powerline easements and may adjust the proposed centerline location of the pipeline and overlapping areas for the Project to reflect the results of these surveys, including appropriate mitigation for safety and operational considerations, as well as landowner and agency concerns, avoidance of sensitive environmental resources, and construction considerations.	RR1, Section 1.0 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	1-1 to 1-10
6	In Section 1.1.2.1.3, expand the text in the bullets to clarify what other states the laterals would extend into if they would not be wholly located in Massachusetts.	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
7	In Section 1.1.2.4.2, clarify in the bullet list that the Granite/Pleasant St. and Cranston-Providence meter stations are existing meter stations that would be modified to increase flow.	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		
8	In Section 1.2.3, provide a table listing the new and modified access roads that are proposed for use, including the location by milepost, the size, and the type of modification required on existing roads. If this information is not available, identify when it will be provided. Indicate whether Tennessee would use temporary or permanent access roads proposed for the Constitution Pipeline Project where it is co-located.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
9	Update Table 1.2-6 to indicate the percentage of landowners where access has not been requested and add a footnote indicating how many landowners granted, then rescinded, survey permission, as well as how rescinded landowner permissions were accounted for in the table.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
10	In Section 1.3.1.4, discuss when the results of any scour analysis will be incorporated in to the Resource Reports and provide a cross-reference to where a detailed discussion is provided.	Tennessee will conduct a scour analysis as access along the pipeline route is granted. Results of the scour analysis will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR1, Section 1.3.1.4 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	1-97
11	Regarding the construction procedures listed in Section 1.3.2: a. discuss the procedures and depth of burial for crossing railroads, foreign pipelines, and utilities; and b. provide a table listing all known foreign pipelines, utilities, railroads, and roads that would be crossed, by milepost.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
12	In Section 1.3.2.2, include a cross-reference as to the section of the Resource Reports that fully describe the criteria for whether groundwater wells and springs within 200 feet of the construction right-of-way will be tested, the testing procedures for water quality and quantity, the timeframe for testing, and measures that would be implemented in the event that water testing indicates an impact on a well.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
13	In Section 1.3.2.2.2, discuss the circumstances under which the stove-pipe construction method would be used instead of the drag-section construction method.	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		
14	Include discussion and consideration of direct pipe trenchless pipeline installation technology in section 1.3.2.5.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
15	In Section 1.3.2.9, ensure that the forthcoming table listing and justifying deviations from the FERC Plan and Procedures, if applicable, include the section of the Plan or Procedures for the requested deviation, the deviation itself, justification for the deviation, and how the deviation would provide equal or greater mitigation. If major modifications to the FERC Plan and Procedures are proposed, Tennessee should provide its own modified versions of the documents that would be used during construction and operation of the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
16	In Section 1.3.3.3, update the text to include New Hampshire in the list of states where air quality impact modeling will be conducted, and associated applications will be filed.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
17	<p>In Section 1.3.4:</p> <p>a. provide the expected construction start date for each segment of pipeline, pipeline lateral, and compressor station, when known;</p> <p>b. discuss the number of spreads and workers per spread required for the proposed laterals;</p> <p>c. clarify whether the construction workers and timeframes provided for compressor and meter stations are those required for each individual facility, or for each type of facility combined;</p> <p>d. provide the number of permanent staff anticipated during operation; and</p> <p>e. provide locations for the new operations offices or district offices that would be required for operation, or clarify that none would be needed.</p>	<p>a. The detailed construction schedule is attached to the October 8, 2015 Response to Comments matrix.</p> <p>b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>c. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>	a. 10/8 Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1a	
18	<p>In Section 1.3.5, provide a more detailed discussion on the environmental training that would be conducted for construction personnel if the Project were approved. Specify which construction personnel would receive training, when and how often the training would occur, and what documents would be provided (e.g., the FERC Plan and Procedures, or the Tennessee Plan and Procedures, as appropriate). In addition, discuss measures to ensure contractor compliance with the required mitigation.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
19	<p>In Section 1.4.1, clarify that the proposed annual vegetation maintenance in uplands would only occur over a 10-foot-wide corridor centered on the pipeline, and that edge-to-edge maintenance would only occur once every three years, as specified in the FERC Plan.</p>	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		
20	<p>Update Table 1.6-1 to include all required permits/consultations for New Hampshire as no Section 106, state listed species, or air quality permits/consultations are listed.</p>	Addressed in the 3/13 Draft ER 1 filing.		
21	<p>In Section 1.7, specify whether power, water, or other utility lines would be constructed for the proposed aboveground facilities.</p>	<p>Potential non-jurisdictional facilities associated with Project compressor stations identified to date have been included. Tennessee will provide updates regarding non-jurisdictional facilities in a supplemental filing as more information becomes available.</p>	<p>RR1, Section 1.7</p> <p>To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p>	1-137 to 1-142
22	<p>Include contact information in the Stakeholder List for the libraries and newspapers identified in Tables 1.8-1 and 1.8-2.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
23	<p>Consult with land managing agencies, state and local planning agencies, and other appropriate entities to identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (e.g., roads, bridges, mining, utility projects, other pipelines and compressor stations, large commercial/industrial/residential developments, etc.) in the potential resource area of impact that could be affected by the Project. Tennessee should describe how it defines the area of impact for each resource, and include a table that identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the project(s) type/name and county;</li> <li>b. approximate distance and direction of the project(s) from the proposed Project facilities;</li> <li>c. a description of the project(s); and</li> <li>d. the current status and schedule of the project(s) (e.g., proposed for October 2015, under construction, completed).</li> </ul> <p>Include a description of cumulative and/or overlapping impacts these projects and the planned Project would have on each environmental resource. Also include descriptions of the measures that would be implemented to minimize these impacts. Lastly, include a map showing the identified projects in relation to the planned Project.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
<b>Draft Resource Report 10</b>				
1	<p>Update Resource Report 10 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. clarify which alternatives and deviations are still being considered and which have been incorporated into the proposed route;</li> <li>b. provide representative figures and tables detailing the locations of incorporated alternatives and deviations, as well as comparisons of impacts for relevant resources and the ultimate reason for its incorporation;</li> <li>c. include at least one alternative for each segment of the proposed Project, including the laterals;</li> <li>d. specify and evaluate any reasonable route alternatives that were suggested by the public or agencies, as well as the feasibility of those alternatives. List and describe the rationale for any alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and dismissed without evaluation; and</li> <li>e. specify and evaluate system alternatives that were suggested by the public or agencies, as well as the feasibility of those alternatives. Include pipeline system alternatives, conservation alternatives, as well as renewable energy alternatives. List and describe the rationale for any alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and dismissed without evaluation.</li> </ul>	Additional information regarding alternatives identified as part of the pre-filing process have been developed and included in this filing. This includes landowner and agency requested route deviations. Table 10.3-16 (landowner requested route deviations) and Table 10.3-17 (Agency-requested route deviations) have been updated (as of 9/4/2015).	RR10, Section 10.3.3 RR10, Tables 10.3-16 and 10.3-17	10-85 to 10-86 10-87 to 10-98
2	<p>Provide a table of the proposed and/or estimated capacities of the pipeline systems reviewed in Section 10.2.2, based on the sources reviewed by Tennessee. In addition, provide a tabular comparative analysis of system alternatives as presented in table 10.2-1 of the FERC's Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation. Depict on maps the locations of the all potential system alternatives, including Portland Natural Gas Transmission System and Granite State Gas Transmission, which appear to be missing from the mapping provided. Consider whether pipeline segments or facilities from different system alternatives could be combined into a hybrid system alternative.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
3	Existing and proposed pipelines, such as the proposed Constitution Pipeline, may be routed along ridge lines in steep terrain. Evaluate the constructability of the proposed NED route where it would be collocated with existing pipelines in steep terrain and where the most suitable location for construction may already be encumbered. Further, identify and describe any other potential constraints associated with collocation with other pipelines or electrical transmission lines including side slopes, urbanized areas, or other factors.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
4	Evaluate whether the lift and lay construction method could be used at any looped pipeline segments operated by Kinder Morgan, and along any existing pipeline segment besides the Haverhill Lateral.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	Include data categories in all alternatives comparison tables for miles or feet of expected side-slope construction (including data for both moderate and severe side slope), shallow bedrock, karst geology, landslides, numbers of landowners affected, residences located within 125 and 250 feet of a proposed work area, and miles or acres of interior forest.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
6	Where the proposed route deviates significantly away (at least 0.5 mile) from the original Northeast Exchange Alternative for a substantial length (at least 1 mile), provide an analysis and comparison of the two routes with particular emphasis regarding the avoidance of potential constraints associated with collocation with the Constitution Pipeline.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
7	For each major alternative in Section 10.3.1, clarify whether modification, addition, or removal of laterals along the proposed route would be required.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
8	Regarding the Constitution Route 1 Alternative: a. specify whether any laterals or aboveground facilities would be required along this alternative at the interconnection with the potential shipper identified in Section 10.3.1.1.1; b. identify the location of the potential project shipper connection with Route Alternative 1 in Figure 10.3-1; and c. clarify the discrepancy in the total length of co-located pipeline in Section 10.3.1.1.1 and Table 10.3-1.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
9	Provide comparison tables for the Article 97 Avoidance and Co-location Route Alternatives and list and describe the subject properties in Resource Report 10, as and depict them in mapping as well.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
10	In Section 10.3.3.2, provide documentation of consultation with Massachusetts agencies to identify and evaluate agency requested minor route deviations and provide alternatives comparison tables. List and describe the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Resource Report 10, as and depict them in mapping as well.	At the request of FERC, the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts have been included on the applicable Figures in Attachment 10a.	RR10, Section 10.3.3.2 RR10, Attachment 10a	10-86 Attachment 10a
11	Provide a table similar to table 10.3-10 containing all of the landowner-requested and agency-requested minor route deviations and include an additional data column indicating whether the stakeholder's concerns have been resolved. Provide updates of this table as appropriate throughout the course of the project.	Table 10.3-16 (landowner requested route deviations) and Table 10.3-17 (Agency-requested route deviations) have been updated (as of 9/4/2015).	RR10, Tables 10.3-16 and 10.3-17	10-87 to 10-98

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
12	Once alternative compressor station locations are available, provide in Section 10.4: a. details on the sizing, locations, limitations, and environmental impacts (including noise and visual impacts) of each alternative; b. an assessment of technology alternatives for compression equipment, providing sufficient data to identify the alternative(s) with the lowest emissions; and c. a specific examination of the feasibility of installing waste heat recovery systems at proposed new and modified compressor units.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
13	Provide an alternatives analysis for all of the compressor stations and for all other permanent, above-ground facilities such as meter stations and mainline valves where appropriate, such as where there could be visual or noise impacts to sensitive receptors.	An alternatives comparative analysis was not conducted for mainline valves and meter stations. Tennessee complied with Department of Transportation ("DOT") requirements for these types of facilities and chose the best available site within the allowable area as per DOT requirements.	RR10, Section 10.6	10-113 to 10-115
14	Provide a discussion of the feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity required and the number of electric motors required. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required for the electric motors.	The feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed new compressor stations has been provided.	RR10, Section 10.5.3	10-109 to 10-113
15	Provide a discussion regarding the feasibility of using waste heat electric generation (cogeneration) for the proposed turbines at the proposed compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity potentially generated on a kilowatt/month basis and compare this with the amount of electricity used by the compressor station(s) per month. Describe the average load factor of the facility and any impediments that would prevent the operation of the compressor station continuously at 60% minimum load. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required under a cogeneration system with return to the electric grid.	A discussion regarding the feasibility of using waste heat electric generation (cogeneration) for the proposed turbines at the proposed compressor stations has been provided.	RR10, Section 10.5.3	10-109 to 10-113

**Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports,  
May 15, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>General</b>				
1	General – Include the information requested for draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 as described in our comments dated February 27, 2015. If any of the requested information cannot be included within the next draft filing, indicate when that information will subsequently be filed.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
2	Respond to the questions from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) included as Attachment A; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service included as Attachment B.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	Tennessee Gas should respond to the specific comment letters identified below: a. The Town of Northfield, Massachusetts (and attachments), filed on April 1, 2015; b. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, filed on April 1, 2015; c. The Town of Amherst, New Hampshire, filed on March 24, 2015; d. The Town of Townsend, Massachusetts, filed on March, 24, 2015; e. The Town of Warwick, Massachusetts, filed on March 9, 2015; f. The Town of Mason, New Hampshire, filed on February 4, 2015; g. The Town of Ashby, Massachusetts, filed on November 23, 2014; h. The Town of Wilmington, Massachusetts, filed on January 20, 2015; i. The Town of Wilmington, Water and Sewer Department, filed on January 28, 2015; j. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Historical Commission, filed on May 1, 2015; k. The Heritage Commission of the Town of Richmond, New Hampshire, filed on February 6, 2015; l. The Town of Tewksbury, Massachusetts, filed on April 27, 2015; m. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Upstate New York Section, filed on April 24, 2015; n. The Berkshire Planning Commission, filed on May 7, 2015; and o. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, filed on May 12, 2015.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 1 - Project Description</b>				
1	Provide the locations and details for new compressor stations. Provide a large scale (1:3,600 or greater) plot plan identifying the proposed engine/compressor units, buildings, piping and other equipment, site property line, and nearby noise-sensitive areas (such as residences, farms, or schools). In addition, provide the mailing list for all landowners within ½ mile of the property boundary of the facility.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
2	<p><b>2. General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 1 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</b></p> <p>a. the location and configuration or temporary workspaces, including justifications for any within 50 feet of wetlands;</p> <p>b. locations and details for meter stations, mainline valves (MLV), pig launchers and receivers, cathodic protection systems, non-jurisdictional facilities, access roads, contractor yards, and other appurtenant facilities;</p> <p>c. updated aerial imagery for the Project area;</p> <p>d. updated acreages for lands affected by the Project;</p> <p>e. environmental construction plans (ECPs), blasting plan, and state-specific invasive species management plans;</p> <p>f. site-specific waterbody and wetland plans and associated crossing techniques;</p> <p>g. site-specific residential construction plans;</p> <p>h. locations and details for horizontal directional drills (HDD);</p> <p>i. complete alignment sheets;</p> <p>j. detailed construction schedule;</p> <p>k. location of shallow bedrock, steep slopes, and side slopes; and</p>	<p>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>b. Updated locations of access roads and contractor yards are provided.</p> <p>c. Updated aerial alignment sheets are provided.</p> <p>d. Land requirements have been updated.</p> <p>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>f. Site-specific wetland and waterbody crossing plans are provided for major crossings. Site-specific wetland and waterbody crossing plans will be provided for all other crossings in a supplemental filing. In addition, workspace configurations for all wetland and waterbody crossings are provided on the aerial alignment sheets.</p> <p>g. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>h. Locations of additional horizontal directional drills (“HDDs”), as well as site-specific plans, are provided.</p> <p>i. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>j. The detailed construction schedule is attached to the October 8, 2015 Response to Comments matrix.</p> <p>k. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>	<p>b. RR8, Attachment 8b, Tbl 8.1-6 RR8, Attachment 8b, Tbl 8.1-7</p> <p>c. Volume II, Appendix F</p> <p>d. RR1, Tbl 1.2-1</p> <p>f. Volume II, Appendix Q Volume II, Appendix F To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>h. RR1, Tbl 1.3-2 Volume II, Appendix Q</p> <p>j. 10/8 Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1a</p>	<p>b. 8b-111 to 8b-118 8b-121 to 8b-129</p> <p>c. N/A</p> <p>d. 1-61 to 1-64</p> <p>f. N/A</p> <p>h. 1-108 to 1-109</p> <p>j. N/A</p>
3	<p>proposed modifications to the Commission’s Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Procedures) Plan and Procedures;</p> <p>Section 1.0 (page 1-2) – Clarify the statement that “Tennessee’s current proposed pipeline alignment along utility corridors is proposed to be generally located five (5) feet outside the existing utility easement.” Indicate whether the construction and permanent right-of-way would directly abut existing easements where possible. Include a descriptive table, with explanations included, for each area where a generally co-located Project segment would temporarily deviate away from other co-located utilities. Include a discussion in Table 1.1-2 regarding the status of negotiations between Tennessee Gas and the owners of other utilities regarding the potential for use of a portion of those entities’ rights-of-way by Tennessee Gas during construction and/or operation.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
4	<p>Section 1.1.2.2.1 (page 1-13) – Confirm whether all temporary workspace needed for the modifications at Station 319 are already owned by Tennessee Gas. In addition, provide a description of work/upgrades that would take place at Station 319 due to the Planned/Proposed Susquehanna West Project.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>		
5	<p>Section 1.2.3 (page 1-48) – Include any measures to be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts on sensitive resources, such as wetlands and forest, along new access roads.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>		
6	<p>Table 1.2-5 – Indicate whether forest, wetlands, waterbodies, or other sensitive resources would be affected by use of the contractor yards. Update draft Resource Reports 2 and 3 appropriately.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
7	Section 1.3.1.13 (page 1-63) – Include a discussion regarding how ridge top areas used during construction would be restored and how post-construction contours may be different than their original condition (this may require an alternative to the FERC Plan Section V.A.5). In addition, describe the source of imported soils during restoration and plans to address potentially associated issues such as the spread of invasive plant species, soil type compatibility, and rock content. Describe any measures that would be employed to avoid allowing backfilled rock to directly contact the pipe. Update Resource Reports 6 and 7 appropriately.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
8	Section 1.3.1.14 (page 1-64) – Confirm whether Tennessee Gas would use a spray diffuser to discharge hydrostatic test water directly into a waterbody where applicable, in lieu of discharge overland based on the potential for reduced environmental impacts on the receiving waters. Indicate whether biocides or other additives would be added to hydrostatic test water. Update Resource Report 2 appropriately.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
9	Section 1.3.2.1 (page 1-73) – Include a discussion of any special measures that Tennessee Gas would use in rugged terrain to address potential issues such as erosion control, rocks rolling off of the right-of-way during construction, and post-restoration slips and landslides.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
10	Section 1.3.2.2 (page 1-76) – Indicate whether Tennessee Gas would coordinate with local and state authorities regarding potential impacts to roads and traffic patterns, as well as a commitment to repair all road damage caused by the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
11	Section 1.3.2.2 (page 1-76) – Include Project-specific plans for burning slash if applicable, and detail measures to be implemented to protect forest, waterbodies, wetlands, air quality, nearby residents, and other sensitive resources in areas where slash would be burned.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
12	Section 1.3.2.3 (page 1-77) – Include in Section 1.3.2.3 a description of what equipment would be used to remove excess rock from agricultural soils and what size of rock would be removed.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
13	Section 1.3.2.5.2 (page 1-79) – Discuss whether Tennessee Gas, in certain circumstances, may be able to pull back an HDD section in sub-sections, thereby increasing flexibility, minimizing the false right-of-way, and precluding the requirement of pulling one continuous section.	At this time, Tennessee is still evaluating each proposed HDD crossing. Geotechnical investigation for each HDD must be completed; however, for some locations, lack of landowner access has hindered the geotechnical investigations. Therefore, the final crossing designs for each HDD have not been finalized to determine the need for false rights-of-way ("ROWS") for pullback sections. Tennessee will provide final HDD plans in a supplemental filing.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.5.2 To be updated in Supplemental Filing	1-106 to 1-107
14	Section 1.3.2.6 (page 1-81) – Include a discussion regarding whether blasting would be used in areas of limestone or karst geology.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
15	Section 1.3.2.7 (page 1-82) – Evaluate the feasibility of additional HDDs in sites containing forested wetlands with an impact of more than 0.5 acre per crossing or in sites containing any high quality or specially designated forested wetland.	Tennessee has investigated specific wetland crossings to determine the feasibility of using HDD based on the specific conditions at the crossing location. Tennessee has not committed to HDD across all forested wetlands with an impact of more than 0.5 acre or high quality or specially designated forested wetlands. However, Tennessee will continue to consult with regulatory agencies regarding wetland crossing procedures. Locations of all proposed HDDs are included in Table 1.3-2 in Resource Report 1. Tennessee will provide final HDD locations in a supplemental filing.	RR2, Sections 2.3.6.4 RR2, Section 2.2.11.4 RR1, Table 1.3-2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing.	2-90 2-69 1-108 to 1-109

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
16	Section 1.3.2.8 (page 1-82) – Evaluate the potential for using HDDs at all major waterbodies (e.g., Schoharie Creek). In addition, evaluate the feasibility of additional HDDs in sites where the following characteristics are present: a. waterbody crossings greater than 30 feet wide where a dry construction method is not feasible; and b. waterbodies listed as sensitive or high quality.	Tennessee has investigated specific waterbody crossings to determine the feasibility of using HDD based on the specific conditions at the crossing location. Tennessee is continuing to evaluate waterbody crossing methods based on field survey information. Locations of all proposed HDDs are included in Table 1.3-2 in Resource Report 1. Tennessee will provide final HDD locations in a supplemental filing.	RR2, Section 2.2.11.4 RR1, Table 1.3-2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	2-69 1-108 to 1-109
17	Section 1.3.2.9.2 (page 1-83) – Indicate whether Tennessee Gas would to the extent possible, position temporary workspace to avoid upland and wetland forest as well as other sensitive resources.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
18	Section 1.3.3.6 (page 1-85) – Indicate whether Tennessee Gas would install communication towers as part of the Project, and if so describe their location and features.	A free-standing communication tower, measuring less than 100 feet with no guy wires but with associated communication lines, will be installed at each new compressor station. No communication towers are anticipated to be installed at new meter stations or mainline valve ("MLV") sites as part of the Project, communication towers in-service at existing meter stations where modifications are proposed will be utilized.	RR1, Section 1.3.3.6	1-116
19	Section 1.3.5 (page 1-86) – Include a discussion regarding whether Tennessee Gas intends to fund a third-party compliance program that would operate at the direction of the Commission staff.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
20	Section 1.4.1 (page 1-87) – Include a detailed description and table listing the nature and frequency of all patrols and inspections that would be used during operation of the pipeline by facility type.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
21	Section 1.4.2 (page 1-88) – Confirm that Tennessee Gas would not use herbicides to maintain the permanent right-of-way for purposes other than invasive plant species control.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
22	Section 1.7 (1-129) – Identify any non-jurisdictional facilities associated with the Project. If there are any non-jurisdictional facilities that would be built as a result of the new gas volumes associated with this Project, include the following detailed information for each facility: a. company/owner; b. type of facility; c. dimensions (pipe diameter, length, horsepower, etc. as appropriate for pipeline and land area for other facilities); d. maps showing locations; e. federal permits required and their status; f. status of local and state permits required; and g. any environmental reviews required for local, state, or federal permitting authorities.	Potential non-jurisdictional facilities associated with Project compressor stations identified to date have been included. Tennessee will provide updates regarding non-jurisdictional facilities in a supplemental filing as more information becomes available.	RR1, Section 1.7 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	1-137 to 1-142
23	Section 1.8 (page 1-129) – Include landowner specific parcel or tract identification numbers within the referenced Landowner Line List.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
24	Section 1.8.1 (page 1-131) – Update the section to include the results for wetland and waterbody field surveys conducted or identify when they will be included.	Wetland Delineation reports have been provided as attachments to Resource Report 2.	RR2, Section 2.3 RR2, Attachment 2c through 2g	2-70 to 2-89 Attachments 2c-2g



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
24 (part 2)	Section 1.9.3 (page 1-146) – In the forthcoming table listing projects that may contribute to cumulative impacts, also include data columns for watershed identification, air quality control region, and basic information (and/or internet links) regarding impacts where available such as number of waterbodies crossed, acres of wetlands affected, acres of forest affected, and number of crossings of the Appalachian Trail.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 2 - Water Use and Quality</b>				
1	<p>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 2 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>a. discussion regarding groundwater classification in the New Hampshire portion of the Project, post-consultation with New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services;</p> <p>b. locations of new compressor stations and associated potential impacts to groundwater;</p> <p>c. location of public and private drinking water wells and springs located within 150 feet of any Project workspace area;</p> <p>d. avoidance and mitigation measures that would be taken around wellhead protection areas (WHPAs);</p> <p>e. exact locations of pipeyards and contractors yards, as well as their potential resource impacts;</p> <p>f. impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for waterbodies containing fisheries resources and how timing restrictions on those waterbodies may impact the Project schedule;</p>	<p>a. Groundwater classification in the New Hampshire portion of the Project have been included in Resource Report 2.</p> <p>b. Consultations to identify potential impacts to groundwater from compressor station locations are in progress. Information received to date is provided in Resource Report 2. Additional information will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>c. Table 2.1-2 identifies all known public and private water supply wells, springs, and locally zoned aquifer protection and/or wellhead protection areas (“WHPAs”) located within 200 feet of construction work areas associated with the Project.</p> <p>d. Tennessee has identified all WHPAs within the Project area. Tennessee is continuing consultation with local governments to determine avoidance and minimization measures around WHPAs. Results of the consultations will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>e. Tennessee has identified 198 contractor yards for the proposed Project. The contractor yards are typically sited in existing fields, existing paved lots, or other previously disturbed areas and will not require any modifications to the existing land use. Tennessee has sited these facilities outside of wetlands to the extent practicable. Locations of proposed contractor yards are depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey (“USGS”) 7.5 minute topographic maps and aerial alignment sheets.</p>	<p>a. RR2, Section 2.1.1.4.3</p> <p>b. RR2, Section 2.1.2  To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>c. RR2, Attachment 2b, Tbl 2.1-2  RR2, Attachment 2b, Tbl 2.1-3</p> <p>d. RR2, Section 2.1.6  To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>e. RR2, Section 2.2.4  RR2, Section 2.3.4  RR8, Section 8.1.4  Volume II, Appendices E and F</p>	<p>a. 2-12</p> <p>b. 2-16</p> <p>c. 2b-1 to 2b-17  2b-19 to 2b-20</p> <p>d. 2-25 to 2-27</p> <p>e. 2-39  2-87 to 2-88  8-19</p>
	<p>g. results of database search for contaminated sediments;</p> <p>h. locations of potable water intakes within three miles downstream of any proposed waterbody crossing;</p> <p>i. hydrostatic test water sources, quantity needed, as well as discharge location;</p> <p>k. description and evaluation for any clearing and disturbance related to obtaining water for the HDD or for installation of the HDD guide wires;</p> <p>l. field survey results and wetland delineation reports;</p> <p>m. identification of wetland impacts associated with each facility;</p> <p>n. wetland mitigation provisions;</p>	<p>f. Waterbodies crossed by the Project or within the construction workspace will be protected by adherence to Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and Tennessee’s Project-specific Environmental Construction Plans (“ECPs”) for each state. In addition, Tennessee will include any additional permit conditions required by federal, state, and local agencies. Tennessee continues to evaluate waterbody crossing procedures including dry crossing, conventional bore, and HDD. Timing for crossing state-designated coldwater or significant coolwater or warmwater fisheries will be based on agency consultations. In the absence of State timing guidance, the Commission’s Procedures will be used.</p> <p>g. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>h. A table of potable water intakes has been provided.</p> <p>i. Hydrostatic test water fill locations and quantity of water needed have been provided. Discharge locations will be dependent on local permit requirements and will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>k. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p> <p>l. Wetland Delineation reports have been provided as attachments to Resource Report 2.</p> <p>m. Construction and operation impacts are discussed for each facility.</p> <p>n. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.</p>	<p>f. RR2, Section 2.2.1  RR3, Section 3.1.4</p> <p>h. RR2, Table 2.1-4</p> <p>i. RR2, Table 2.2-9  To be updated in Supplemental Filing</p> <p>l. RR2, Attachments 2c - 2g  m. RR2, Section 2.3.5</p>	<p>f. 2-63  3-18 to 3-20</p> <p>h. 2-18</p> <p>i. 2-47 to 2-50</p> <p>l. Attachments 3=2c-2g  m. 2-88 to 2-89</p>
	<p>o. State Wetland Classifications; and</p> <p>p. wetland-specific crossing methods.</p>	<p>o. State wetland classifications are provided in tables as an attachment to Resource Report 2.</p> <p>p. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>o. RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.3-1, 2.3-3, 2.3-5, 2.3-7, and 2.3-9</p>	<p>2b-59 to 2b-68  2b-71 to 2b-88  2b-91 to 2b-108  2b-111 to 2b-133  2b-137 to 2b-140</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
2	2. General – Include justification for all modifications to the Commission’s Procedures including but not necessarily limited to: a. Section 2.2.1.2 (page 2-44) – waterbodies containing sensitive fisheries; b. Section 2.2.2 (page 2-73) – construction of aboveground and pipeline appurtenant facilities; c. Section 2.2.9.1 (page 2-81) – crossing methods for sensitive surface waters; d. Section 2.3.5.1 (page 2-156) – site-specific locations of additional temporary workspace (ATWS) within 50 feet of wetlands; and e. Table 2.3-12 (page 2-161) – any site-specific locations where a construction workspace greater than 75 feet would be utilized in wetlands.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	Section 2.1 (General) – In the groundwater descriptions, include a detailed description of the aquifers in each state including the names, beginning and ending MPs for each crossing, confining layers, principal use, depth to water, and general water quality. Update Table 2.1-2 to include aquifer, well depth, and yield.	Detailed descriptions of aquifers crossed in each state have been provided. A new table including aquifer name, beginning and ending mileposts for each crossing, well depth, and yield will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR2, Section 2.1 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	2-2 to 2-15
4	Section 2.1.1.2.1 (pages 2-4 to 2-6) – Clarify which aquifer system is associated with the sole source aquifer (SSA). Confirm that “Total Mileage” is equivalent to the proposed crossing length of the SSA.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Section 2.1.1.2.3 (pages 2-7 to 2-8) – Define the groundwater designation ‘Class GA.’	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	Section 2.1.1.3.1 (page 2-8) – Include a discussion and complete citations for the U.S. Geological publications Survey publications that characterize the aquifers in the Project area.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Sections 2.1.1.3, 2.1.1.5, and 2.1.6 (page 2-8, 2-11, and 2-19) – Confirm whether Massachusetts and Connecticut have a Wellhead Protection Program and identify WHPAs accordingly. Discuss construction/operations precautions that would be implemented near WHPAs as well as any mitigation measures that may be required by wellhead protection area managers.	Tennessee proposes to implement Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) designed to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate potential impacts on groundwater during construction and operation as detailed within the Project-specific ECPs for each state and Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures. Tennessee will continue consultation with local governments to determine avoidance and minimization measures for areas where the pipeline crosses WHPAs.	RR2, Section 2.1.5 RR2, Section 2.1.6 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N Volume II, Appendix H	2-17 to 2-25 2-25 to 2-27
8	Section 2.1.1.3.2 (page 2-9) – Confirm whether the Project would impact the drinking water well protected by the Massachusetts Source Water Assessment Program (located in the Town of Erving).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
9	Section 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 (page 2-15 and 2-19) –Include a discussion of all surface water protection areas depicted in Figure 2.1-4 that could be impacted by the Project and mitigation measures for work conducted within surface water protection areas.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
10	Section 2.1.6 (page 2-19) – Confirm whether Tennessee Gas would provide pre- and post-construction testing of water quantity and quality to landowners with wells or springs located within 150 feet of any workspace.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
11	Section 2.1.6 (page 2-19) – Include a discussion of potential aquifer impacts resulting from ground disturbing activities (e.g., HDD drilling, blasting). Include mitigation measures for potentially impacted springs and aquifers.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
12	Section 2.2 – Update section to include results from waterbody field surveys. Discuss typical staging area requirements at waterbody crossings that would be crossed in each state. Identify all waterbodies crossed within karst-prone areas and their crossing methods.	Surfaces waters crossed, crossing methods, and identification of karst-prone areas are provided in tables as an attachment to Resource Report 2.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.2-4 to 2.2-8	2b-27 to 2b-58
13	Update Tables 2.2-4, 2.2-5, 2.2-6, 2.2-7, and 2.2-8 showing waterbodies crossed by the Project to include the correct crossing width, crossing method, timing restrictions, and any information that is missing or marked as “TBD.” Provide clarification on why some waterbodies have “unknown” listed under type of waterbody and clarify what the term “unknown” indicates.	Tables have been updated to include requested information.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.2-4 to 2.2-8	2b-27 to 2b-58
14	Section 2.2.5 (page 2-73) – Identify all areas with known or potentially contaminated sediments.	Tennessee contacted state environmental agencies in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut and has searched federal and state databases to determine potential waterbodies with known contaminated sediments crossed by the Project. Contaminated sediments within the Project area are identified by Project component in Section 2.2.5.	RR2, Section 2.2.5 RR2, Attachment 2a, Figure 2.1-3	2-40 to 2-42 Attachment 2a
15	Section 2.2.6 (page 2-76) – Update text based on agency consultations regarding the presence of public/private wells, surface water intakes, and springs in the vicinity of the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
16	Section 2.2.7 (page 2-79) – Include data for hydrostatic test pressure, volume (in gallons) of hydrostatic test water by specific source location (waterbody and milepost [MP]), the expected month water would be withdrawn and discharged, and source alternatives. Identify if any chemicals that may be added to the test water and include proposed treatment and/or disposal method for treated discharge water. Include specific locations of the test water discharges. Include a Hydrostatic Test Plan.	Hydrostatic test water fill locations and quantity of water needed have been provided. Discharge locations for hydrostatic test water will be subject to local permits. A Hydrostatic Test Plan will be prepared and provided with the Implementation Plan prior to construction. The Hydrostatic Test Plan will provide detailed information on hydrostatic test water fill and discharge locations, as well as month of withdraw and discharge.	RR2, Section 2.2.7 RR2, Table 2.2-9	2-47 2-47 to 2-50
17	Section 2.2.9 (page 2-88) – Provide updated information on sensitive waterbodies and identify mitigation measures for potential impacts to sensitive waterbodies and fisheries.  Section 2.2.10 (page 2-89) – Discuss potential surface water impacts resulting from the operation of the Project (e.g., increased runoff resulting from increased impervious surface).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.  All aboveground facilities resulting in impervious surfaces will be designed and permitted according to applicable state and federal regulation, including stormwater mitigation. No surface water impacts are expected from the operation of these facilities.	RR2, Section 2.2.10	2-62 to 2-63
18	Section 2.2.11 (page 2-90) – Include the rationale that a minimum cover depth of 5 feet is adequate for all waterbodies.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
19	Section 2.3 (General) – Update the wetlands section to include results from wetland field surveys. Include the Wetland Delineation Report or an estimate of when Wetland Delineation Report will be included. Clarify how construction impact acreages were calculated. In each table, include specific construction right-of-way widths for each wetland crossed and note any wetlands with irregular workspaces which would create impacts greater than simply calculating length multiplied by width.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
20	Update Tables 2.3-1, 2.3-3, 2.3-5, 2.3-7, and 2.3-9 showing wetlands crossed by the Project to include crossing methods, state wetland classification, crossing length, and any information that is missing or marked as "TBD".	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 3 - Fisheries, Wildlife, and Vegetation</b>				
1	<p>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 3 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. copies of additional or continued state and federal agency correspondence with state and federal agencies regarding potential Project-related impacts on existing aquatic, wildlife, vegetation resources (including state- and federally protected species) and associated mitigation measures. The topics addressed in these correspondences should include, but not necessarily be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. fisheries of special concern;</li> <li>ii. water quality designations;</li> <li>iii. construction timing restrictions;</li> <li>iv. Priority Habitats mapped by Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP);</li> <li>v. the incorporation of Massachusetts BioMap 2 data in agency analyses;</li> <li>vi. mitigation measures to protect interior forest breeding birds and other wildlife;</li> <li>vii. crossing methods that would be used in significant or sensitive wildlife habitats;</li> <li>viii. vegetative communities of special concern; and</li> <li>ix. protected species with the potential to occur within the Project area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. a discussion and figures of the interior forest blocks that would be crossed by the Project, as mapped by Tennessee Gas;</li> <li>c. results of field surveys conducted to characterize the disposition landscape where the Project would cross the Appalachian Trail as well as a crossing plan for the same location;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>b. Contiguous forested tracts greater than 100 acres in size crossed by the Project were evaluated, including both new pipeline corridor and co-located corridor. In areas where a new corridor is proposed, Tennessee has calculated interior forest loss resulting from direct impacts of the Project footprint and evaluated indirect impacts to remaining patches resulting from edge effect.</li> <li>c. Tennessee has developed a Trail Crossing Plan that establishes protocols to protect recreational users of the Appalachian Trail during construction, avoid and minimize impacts to the Trail and local environment, preserve the integrity of the Trail and user experience, and facilitate coordination with stakeholders through design and implementation. As of the date of this Resource Report, Tennessee has not obtained approval from the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation to conduct biological field surveys and Tennessee will fully characterize the natural landscape in the area where the Project will cross the Appalachian Trail once survey access has been granted and the Trail Crossing Plan will be updated accordingly. Tennessee will also continue to coordinate with the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game regarding the proposed crossing of the adjacent properties to assess impacts and avoid, and minimize impacts to the extent practicable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. RR3, Section 3.2.2.6</li> <li>RR3, Table 3.2-3</li> <li>RR3, Section 3.2.3.3</li> <li>c. RR3, Section 3.2.2.3.3</li> <li>Volume II, Appendix L, Attachment L14</li> <li>To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. 3-53 to 3-56</li> <li>3b-13 to 3b-27</li> <li>Attachment 3a</li> <li>c. 3-39 to 3-40</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. a determination of whether or not the Project would cross the Talcott Mountain State Forest in New Hampshire and associated impacts and mitigation if appropriate;</li> <li>e. a list of vegetative community types that would be crossed by the Project area based on National Land Cover Database mapping for the entire Project area;</li> <li>f. a discussion of impacts associated with the temporary or permanent replacement of established, woody, or scrub/shrub vegetation with herbaceous growth, if applicable;</li> <li>g. a discussion of potential construction and operation impacts on vegetation associated with aboveground facilities and appurtenant facilities (MLVs, pig launchers and receivers), temporary and permanent access roads, pipe and contractor yards, cathodic protection systems, and alternating current (AC) mitigation systems;</li> <li>h. copies of consultations with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), local soil and water conservation districts, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding right-of-way re-seeding recommendations;</li> <li>i. state-specific Invasive Species Management plans; and</li> <li>j. locations, timing, and results of species-specific surveys conducted for protected species and their habitats within the Project area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>f. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>g. Tennessee has attempted to avoid and minimize impacts to vegetation communities of special concern, habitats supporting rare plant species and vernal pools by siting aboveground and appurtenant facilities within or adjacent to the permanent ROW and by selecting previously disturbed areas for use as contractor yards. Vernal pool surveys are ongoing and a detailed assessment of vernal pool impacts will be provided in a supplemental filing.</li> <li>h. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>i. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</li> <li>j. Detailed survey results are provided directly to the corresponding agency and are included in the Confidential Volume, Volume III.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. RR3, Section 3.3.3</li> <li>To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</li> <li>j. Volume III, Appendix BB</li> <li>Volume III, Appendix FF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. 3-86 to 3-87</li> <li>j. N/A</li> </ul>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
2	<p>General – Regarding the April 1, 2015 listing of the northern long-eared bat as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), update the following information:</p> <p>a. species current status and implications for the Project;</p> <p>b. revised or additional protection and mitigation measures recommended by state and federal agencies, including requests for surveys. Include updated agency correspondence.</p> <p>c. Table 3.2-1 (3-23) and Table 3.4-1 (page 3-86) – Table 3.2-1 shows northern long-eared bats as being a common wildlife species potentially present in upland and forested wetland habitat types crossed by the Project in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. However, Table 3.4-1 shows New York as the only state in which the species could potentially occur within the Project area. Clarify this apparent discrepancy.</p> <p>d. Section 3.4.2.1.2 (page 3-103) – Section 3.4.2.1.2 states that the USFWS recommends that Tennessee Gas perform biological surveys in the vicinity of the Project alignment to determine potential effects. Confirm whether or not Tennessee Gas plans to conduct these surveys, and provide a timeline for their completion, if applicable.</p>	<p>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>c. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
3	<p>Section 3.0 (page 3-2) – Section 3.0 states that 80% of the pipeline will be co-located with other rights-of-way, while Section 3.2.2.6 states 83% will be co-located with other rights-of-way. Address this discrepancy.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
4	<p>Section 3.1 and 3.3 (general) – Include copies of the following agency correspondence referenced in the text:</p> <p>a. Pennsylvania Game Commission, September 24, 2014 and January 21, 2015;</p> <p>b. New York Natural Heritage Program, October 3, 2014;</p> <p>c. Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, October 16, 2014;</p> <p>d. Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, October 16, 2014;</p> <p>e. USFWS, October 17, 2014;</p> <p>f. U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 28, 2015; and</p> <p>g. Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions, February 6, 2015.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
5	<p>Table 3.1-3 – Update table with a more recent reference and update the reference section accordingly.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
6	<p>Section 3.1.3 (page 3-15) – include a discussion of the methods that would be used to revegetate waterbody banks and restore them to their pre-construction conditions.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
7	<p>Section 3.2.1.3 (page 3-20) – Clarify whether successional palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS) areas are considered wetlands or open land.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
8	<p>Table 3.2-4 – Include data regarding interior forest and edge forest crossed by the Project.</p>	<p>Table 3.2-3, Interior Forest and Edge Forest Crossed by the Project has been included.</p>	<p>RR3, Attachment 3b, Table 3.2-3</p>	<p>3b-13 to 3b-27</p>
9	<p>Section 3.2.2.3.3 (page 3-40) – Define “disposition landscape”.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
10	Section 3.3.2.3.2 (page 3-76) – Include a source for the statement that “the Massachusetts Audubon Society identifies the most serious threat to this ecosystem as natural ecological succession, and that regular mowing and/or burning of vegetation is necessary to maintain existing grassland and pitch pine communities.”	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
11	Section 3.3.2.3.2 (page 3-76) – Confirm whether Tennessee Gas is coordinating with appropriate state agencies regarding vegetation communities of special concern located throughout the Project area.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Section 3.3.2.3.3 (page 3-76) – Confirm whether or not the Project (including temporary construction workspace) would cross any Terrestrial Hemlock Ravine natural community.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
13	Section 3.3.2.5 (page 3-78) – Clarify whether the floodplain forest habitat along the Farmington River along Segment S would be impacted by the HDD crossing at this location. Confirm that the text and Table 2.2-8 agree on the location, crossing methods and potential impacts.	Details regarding potential effects of the HDD crossing method are described in the Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan included as a part of the state-specific ECPs. Tennessee is currently planning a 1,570-foot HDD beneath the Farmington River. As currently designed, the only proposed impacts at this locations are associated with the HDD entry/exit pad located south of the river, which will impact approximately 0.13 acres of forested wetlands. These impacts are located outside of the critical floodplain forest habitat as mapped by the state, but are within the limits of field delineated wetlands that border on the Farmington River.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 5 RR3, Section 3.3.2.5	3-84 to 3-85
14	Section 3.3.4.1 (page 3-80) – Include a description of the circumstances in which a tree located within an area slated for vegetation clearing would not be felled.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
15	Discuss how Tennessee Gas intends to address the bat hibernacula present near the Wright Compressor Station.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 4 - Cultural Resources</b>				
1	Include all information in first draft Resource Report 4 labeled as “TBD” or pending, not necessarily limited to: a. Table 4.4-4 (Parcel), Table 4.4-6 (Parcel), Table 4.4.18 (Parcel), Table 4.4-20 (Parcel), and Table 4.4-21 (Parcel); and b. Data missing from the first draft Resource Report 4, such as tables for the Susquehanna County PA Supply Path Head Station, Delaware County NY Supply Path Mid Station, Schoharie County NY Supply Path Tail Station, Schoharie County NY Market Path Tail Station, Rensselaer County NY Market Path Mid Station, Maritimes Delivery Line in Middlesex County MA, Concord Delivery Line in Middlesex County MA, Fitchburg Lateral Extension in MA, North Worcester Lateral in MA, Market Path Station 2 in Berkshire County MA, Market Path Mid Station 3 in Franklin County MA, Market Path Tail Station in Middlesex County MA, Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment in NH, portion of Haverhill Lateral in NH, portion of Fitchburg Lateral in NH, Market Path Mid Station 4 in Hillsborough County NH, the 300 Line Loop in CT, and the Samford Loop in CT.	a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing. b. Field surveys are underway or scheduled to determine if archaeological sites are present. Interim Progress Reports are provided in Volume III.	b. RR4, Section 4.4.2 Volume III, Appendix CC	b. 4-51 to 4-139
2	Include all new and previously unfiled correspondence, meeting notes, phone logs, or emails between Tennessee Gas and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs). This should include copies of comments from the Massachusetts SHPO dated October 1, 2014 and January 26 and April 22, 2015.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
3	Include all new or previously unfiled correspondence, meeting notes, phone logs, or emails between Tennessee Gas and interested Indian tribes. This should include copies of notes from the March 18 and April 27, 2015 meetings with Indian tribes. Update Table 4.2-1 accordingly.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	Attachment 4a – Pages 239 through 418 appear to be duplicates of pages 59 through 238. Update the attachment to remove any duplicated correspondence from SHPOs and tribes.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Include copies of first draft work plans-research designs produced for each state. Document that the research designs-survey protocols were submitted to the SHPO for each state, and interested Indian tribes, and file the comments of the SHPOs and tribes on the work plans. File revised work plans for each state that address the comments of the SHPOs and tribes.	Work plans for each state are provided in Volume III.	Volume III, Appendix DD	N/A
6	Include copies of the draft Unanticipated Discovery Plan for each state. Document that the Discovery Plans were submitted to the SHPOs and interested tribes. File comments from the SHPOs and tribes on the Discovery Plans. File revised plans that address the comments of the SHPOs and tribes.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Explain how Native American monitors or survey crew members would be incorporated into the on-the-ground cultural resources inventories conducted through Tennessee's consultant, Louis Berger. Include copies of the results of investigations by Indian tribes to identify traditional cultural properties, ceremonial stone landscapes, burials, sacred sites, or other properties of cultural or religious importance to tribes that historically used or occupied the Project area.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	At a minimum, Resource Report 4 should include an Overview Report that complies with Section V of the staff's "Guidelines for Reporting on Cultural Resources Investigations for Pipeline Projects," and includes the results of a literature review and site file search. Revise all the tables listing previously recorded archaeological sites and aboveground historic sites to cover all sites within 0.5 mile of the proposed facilities, including Smithsonian site number, site name if known, site type, segment, parcel, milepost or location, distance in feet from centerline, recorder and date, evaluation, and SHPO opinion of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility and the date of that determination.	Report submissions to State Historic Preservation Offices ("SHPOs") are filed in Resource Report 4, Volume III, Appendix DD. Report submissions to tribes (sent in tandem with SHPO submissions) are included in the weekly tribal updates filed in Resource Report 4, Volume III, Appendix EE.	Volume III, Appendix CC Volume III, Appendix DD Volume III, Appendix EE	N/A
9	Include a schedule for the conduct of cultural resources surveys, and the filing of the results of those investigations. Also, include a table that lists all Project segments covered by a cultural resources survey, the date of the survey, and the archaeological or historic standing structures recorded within each inventoried segment, by state. The data in the table of newly identified sites should include Smithsonian site number, site name if known, site type, segment, parcel, milepost or location, distance in feet from centerline, company/recorder and date of recordation, NRHP evaluation, and recommendation for future work. File copies of all cultural resources survey reports and the comments of the SHPOs and Indian tribes on those reports.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
10	Include a response to the February 9, 2015 letter from the town of Milford, New Hampshire, indicating how historic resources would be identified along the pipeline route through the town, and addressing how the town would be included as a "consulting party" in the Section 106 compliance process.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
11	At a site visit of the planning crossing of the Hudson River, FERC staff identified a small graveyard approximately 400 feet from the west bank of the river. Currently the pipeline centerline would be very near the site. Provide an avoidance plan for this site.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Document that Tennessee Gas has submitted a revised research design for Massachusetts in response to comments from the SHPO on the first draft.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 5 - Socioeconomics</b>				
1	General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 5 as pending or "TBD" (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: Section 5.8 (page 5-12) – Environmental Justice discussion for aboveground facilities. Include a table that includes a breakdown of minority and low-income populations near each facility.	The Environmental Justice analysis has been revised as requested.	RR5, Section 5.9	5-19 to 5-23
2	Section 5.1.3 (page 5-3) – Include an estimated percentage of the non-local workers that would be relocating to the Project area with their families. Include an estimate of the total population increase to the Project area.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	Section 5.1.3 (page 5-3) – Include an estimate of the average construction workforce and peak construction workforce by year for pipeline facilities and for above ground facilities.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	Table 5.2-1 (page 5-5) – In footnote number 2, clarify how Rental Vacancy Rate is determined including the units.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Section 5.3 (page 5-7) – For each county in the Project area, include the following: a. number of police departments; b. number of fire departments; c. number of school districts and total enrollment; and d. number of hospitals and total number of hospital beds.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	Section 5.4 (page 5-9) – Specify the typical and maximum duration of a complete road closure when no detour is available, and include mitigation measures to ensure emergency access during these periods.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Section 5.4 (page 5-10) – Discuss the likelihood or provide an affirmative statement of whether "contractors may utilize buses" for worker transportation (emphasis added). Include locations of any "Park-N-Ride areas" and discuss traffic management and mitigation measures at these areas.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	Section 5.8 (page 5-12) – Include an environmental justice analysis (please refer to guidance and comments by the EPA) and discussion for the pipeline portion of the Project. Include a table that includes a breakdown of minority and low-income populations for each state and county crossed by the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 6 - Geological Resources</b>				
1	<p>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 6 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>a. mines reported along the proposed pipeline routes based on state databases;</p> <p>b. oil and gas well locations;</p> <p>c. areas of severe erosion;</p> <p>d. faults crossed by Project pipeline facilities;</p> <p>e. steep slopes (15 to 30 percent) crossed by Project;</p>	<p>a. State data for mines has been used for Pennsylvania and New York. USGS Data has been used for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. USGS Mineral Resources database was used to identify and locate nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in Massachusetts since the State Geographic Information Systems (“GIS”) data, Massachusetts Office of Geographic Information, does not currently provide mineral resources. USGS Mineral Resources database was utilized to identify and locate nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in New Hampshire since the State GIS database, New Hampshire Geographic Information Systems, does not currently provide mineral resources, mines and quarries, and New Hampshire Geological Survey has yet to provide a list of quarries within the vicinity of the Project facilities. USGS Mineral Resources data was used to identify and located nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in Connecticut since State GIS, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection GIS, mineral resources, mines and quarries, is not currently available.</p> <p>b. Complete information for oil and gas wells in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and aboveground and appurtenant facilities has been provided.</p> <p>c. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>a. RR6, Section 6.3.1 RR6, Table 6.3-1</p> <p>b. RR6, Section 6.3.2 RR6, Tables 6.3-6 through 6.3-10</p>	<p>a. 6-36 6-37 to 6-40</p> <p>b. 6-53 to 6-54 6-55 to 6-61</p>
	<p>f. blasting locations by MP; and</p> <p>g. Paleontological Resources Plan.</p>	<p>f. Potential blasting areas are equivalent to those areas having shallow depth to bedrock (less than 5 feet) presented in Table 6.2 1 in Attachment 6b. Potential blasting locations are identified using available mapping and soils data provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey (USDA-NRCS 2014b) and will be field verified prior to construction. Tennessee has provided potential blasting areas (those areas having shallow depth of bedrock or outcrops), but notes that a complete list of blasting locations can only be accurately determined in the field during the construction process. Blasting will generally be limited to areas of consolidated rock.</p> <p>g. Tennessee has provided a Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains as part of the state-specific ECPs and submitted as an attachment to Resource Report 4.</p>	<p>f. RR6, Section 6.2 RR6, Attachment 6b, Table 6.2-1 RR6, Table 6.2-2</p> <p>g. RR4, Attachment 4a</p>	<p>f. 6-31 to 6-36 6b-45 to 6b-57 6-34 to 6-35</p> <p>g. Attachment 4a</p>
2	<p>General – Clarify whether Tennessee Gas will be conducting geotechnical field surveys. Include the following information regarding field surveys for assessing potential hazards from karst, karst features within the right-of-way (ROW), steep slopes, and landslides:</p> <p>a. what areas would be surveyed;</p> <p>b. a schedule for both when surveys would be conducted and when results would be made available;</p> <p>c. who would conduct the surveys, e.g., a geotechnical engineer or certified geologist; and</p> <p>d. if site specific recommendations for construction techniques would be developed for areas identified as having a hazard.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
3	Section 6.2 (pages 6-67 to 6-73) – Include the following information is incorporated into the blasting plan, Resource Report 6, and other Resource Reports as appropriate: a. Federal and state regulations that would be adhered to if blasting would be needed; b. monitoring of blasting including peak particle velocity; c. the monitoring of wells and springs within proximity to blasting activities including the type of monitoring, when monitoring would take place, and any specific testing that would take place; d. damage mitigation measures including under what conditions the measures	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	Section 6.3 (pages 6-73 to 6-82) – If any mines surface and/or underground are located proximal to, or would be crossed by, the Project. Include a detailed discussion of measures that would be taken to minimize hazards to the pipeline from mining operations. Include a discussion of: a. how hazards occurring due to blasting would be minimized; b. measures that would be used to prevent potential damage from excavation; c. discussion of unstable surfaces, landslides, and slumping in mining areas; and d. measures to prevent contamination from mine tailings.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Section 6.3 (page 6-73 to 6-82) – Include a table and discussion of oil and gas wells located within 0.25 mile of the pipelines, ATWS, aboveground facilities, and access roads by MP. Include the following information: a. the total number of active, inactive (plugged), and proposed wells that would be within 0.25 mile of the Project; b. identify any natural gas storage facilities that would be located with 0.25 mile of the Project; c. measures that would protect any well that may be located within the working area and/or located proximal to the working area; and d. measures that would be taken if an unknown and unmapped well is encountered during construction.	Complete information for oil and gas wells in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and aboveground and appurtenant facilities has been provided. a. Complete information for oil and gas wells in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and aboveground and appurtenant facilities has been provided. b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing. c. No work is proposed within close proximity to any oil and/or gas wells along the entirety of the Project route. d. It is unlikely that Tennessee will encounter an unknown oil or gas well within the construction workspace. However, if encountered Tennessee will contact the owner of the oil or gas well and work with them to avoid impacts and mitigate impacts as necessary.	RR6, Section 6.3.2 RR6, Tables 6.3-6 through 6.3-10 a. RR6, Section 6.3.2 RR6, Tables 6.3-6 through 6.3-10 c. RR6, Section 6.3.3 d. RR6, Section 6.3.2.1	6-53 to 6-54 6-55 to 6-61 a. 6-53 to 6-54 6-55 to 6-61 c. 6-62 d. 6-53
6	Section 6.4.1.2 (pages 6-92 to 6-96) – Include US Geological Survey (USGS) probability estimates for both 2 percent and 10 percent exceedance for all states. Include a figure that displays the Project and the seismic probability zones for both 2 percent and 10 percent exceedances in 50 years.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Section 6.4.1.2.1 (page 6-93) – Include a citation for the second bulleted statement in this section.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	Section 6.4.1.2.1 (page 6-93) – Define “small to moderate.” in the third bulleted statement in this section.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
9	Table 6.4-3 – Include the type of fault, a class category for the listed faults, identify if the faults are class A, B, C, or D within the USGS fault data base, and include the age of the most recent movement or displacement for each.	There are no USGS class faults in the vicinity of the pipeline.	RR6, Section 6.4.3 RR6, Table 6.4-3	6-68 to 6-70 6-71 to 6-73
10	Section 6.4.1.3.3 (page 6-96) – Table 6.4-3 identifies numerous faults crossed by the Project in Massachusetts; however, the text in Section 6.4.1.3.3 states that the Project would potentially cross three fault lines in Massachusetts. Clarify this discrepancy.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
11	Section 6.4.1.4.7 (page 6-112) – As part of mitigation measures for Project areas located in areas of potential karst terrain prepare a karst mitigation plan that identifies who would be responsible for identifying karst features during construction, who would be notified of the karst features discovery, general karst remediation measures that could be used, and if a geotechnical expert, such as a certified geologist, would be employed to evaluate the karst feature and include site specific remediation recommendations.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Section 6.4.1.4.7 (page 6-114) - Prepare and include a mitigation plan for post-construction karst development within the ROW	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
13	Section 6.4.1.5 (page 6-115) - Provide a table of landslide susceptibility/incidence showing the MP intervals of areas crossed by the pipeline that are prone to landsliding where construction would take place along the toes of slopes and/or on side-slopes.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 7 - Soils</b>				
1	General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 7 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: a. acreage of prime farmland soils that would be affected by construction and operation associated with compressor stations and MLVs; b. state-Specific ECPs; and c. proposed mitigation to minimize impact on soils.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
2	General – Include justification for any modifications to the Commission’s Plan.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	General – Include a table and discussion of vulnerable soils crossed by the Project based on NRCS guidelines.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	General – Include summary tables that identify soil limitations that would be impacted by construction of the Project for pipeline facilities, aboveground facilities (including compressor stations, meter stations, and MLVs), temporary access roads, permanent access roads, and contractor yards by segment, MPs, state and county in acres. Include a table for both permanent impacts and temporary impacts. An example of a summary table is provided below.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	General – Include a Section addressing invasive plant species and soil pests. The Section should address development of procedures, in coordination with the appropriate state and local agencies, to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive species, noxious weeds, and soil pests resulting from construction and restoration activities.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	General – Include the mitigation measures that Tennessee Gas would incorporate into its state-specific ECPs to mitigate impact to soils including erosion prone soils, stony/rocky soils and shallow depth to bedrock, soil compaction, low revegetation potential, poor drainage, hydric soils, and prime farmlands.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	General – Include a discussion on ground heaving and any potential hazards it might pose to the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
8	General – Include a discussion of stony / rocky soils and include this soil limitation in Tables 7.1-1 through 7.1-3, 7.2-1, and 7.3-1.	Rock material 4 inches in size or larger, including blasted rock, if necessary, will be disposed of in one or more of the following ways to avoid the introduction of rock into the topsoil at the completion of construction activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buried on the ROW or in approved construction work areas either in the ditchline or as fill during grade cut restoration in accordance with the construction specifications. In managed agricultural lands, wetlands, and residential areas, rock may only be backfilled to the top of the existing bedrock profile;</li> <li>• Windrowed per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Used as a fenceline or all-terrain vehicle deterrent along property lines as practicable and per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Removed and disposed of at an appropriately approved site; and</li> <li>• Used as riprap for stream bank stabilization where allowed by an applicable regulatory agency(ies).</li> </ul>	RR7, Section 7.5.5 RR7, Attachment 7b	7-17 Attachment 7b
9	Section 7.3 (page 7-5) – Include a table describing the extent of prime farmlands including the Project facility, state, county, and MPs.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
10	Section 7.3 (page 7-5) – Include a summary table of impacts to prime farmlands and farmlands of state wide importance by type. See the preferred format below.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
11	Section 7.4.3 (page 7-8) – Clarify whether Tennessee Gas would use timber or board mats to prevent compaction instead of coconut fiber mats and geotextile fabric.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Section 7.4.3 (page 7-8) – Specify at what interval Tennessee Gas would conduct soil compaction tests in agricultural and residential areas.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
13	Section 7.5.2 (page 7-10) – Delete the word “annually” in the first sentence of this Section. Delete the word “cultivated” and replace with the word “managed” in the second sentence of this Section.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
14	Section 7.5.2 (page 7-11) – Add another bullet to the first bulleted list in this section addressing stabilization of the topsoil windrow.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
15	Attachment 7B (page 7b-1 to 7b-101) – In Tables 7.1-1, 7.1-2, and 7.1-3, include the revegetation potential as either low, moderate, and high instead of as “yes” or “N/A” and define these ranges.	Soils with poor revegetation potential (defined as high, moderate, or low) have been identified in Table 7.3-1.	RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1	7b-229 to 7b-281
16	Attachment 7B (page 7b-1 to 7b-101) – Increase the font size of the footnotes for Tables 7.1-1, 7.1-2, and 7.1-3.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
17	Attachment 7B (page 7b-1 to 7b-66) – In Table 7.1-1, several soil series including but not limited to Holly Soils, Udifluvents, cobbly, and Medisaprists, ponded have a revegetation potential listed as N/A. Confirm whether or not these soil series are not revegetation potential is not applicable for each of these soil series, and, if so, identify why the revegetation potential is not applicable.	Soils with poor revegetation potential (defined as high, moderate, or low) have been identified in Table 7.3-1.	RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1	7b-229 to 7b-281
18	Attachment 7B (page 7b-67 to 7b-73) – In Table 7.1-2, clarify why all aspects of the table are listed as N/A for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
19	Attachment 7B (page 7b-67 to 7b-73) – In Table 7.2-1, include the type of facility (e.g., MLV, compressor station).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 8 - Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics</b>				
1	<p><b>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 8 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</b></p> <p>a. Section 8.1.1.3 (page 8-3) – Locations of each ATWS and justifications for any modifications to FERC’s Plan;</p> <p>b. Table 8.1-2 (pages 8-6 to 8-8) – Missing acreages for various Project facilities;</p> <p>c. Table 8.1-3 (pages 8-9 to 8-12) – ROW cross-section diagram;</p> <p>d. Section 8.1.2 (page 8-13) – Locations of aboveground and appurtenant facilities within the text, Table 8.1-5, and associated updates to Volume II, Appendix F;</p> <p>e. Section 8.1.3 (page 8-17) – Locations of additional pipe and contractor yards within the text, Table 8.1-6, and associated updates to Volume II, Appendices E and F;</p> <p>f. Table 8.1-6 (pages 8-18 to 8-19) –Locations of new contractor and pipe yards within New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts;</p> <p><b>g. Section 8.1.4 (page 8-20) – Locations of additional access roads in section, Table 8.1-7 and Volume II, Appendices E and F;</b></p> <p>h. Section 8.1.6.1 (page 8-25) – ECPs;</p> <p>i. Table 8.1-11 (page 8-29) – Railroad crossings for the Project;</p>	<p>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>c. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>f. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p><b>g. Table 8.1-6 has been updated. Appendices E and F have been updated.</b></p> <p>h. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>i. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>g. RRS, Attachment 8b, Table 8.1-6  Volume II, Appendices F and G</p>	<p>g. 8b-111 to 8b-118</p>
	<p>j. Section 8.2.1 (page 8-31 to 8-35) –Updated correspondence with planning agencies regarding planned development and impacts and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.</p> <p>k. Table 8.2-1 (page 8-32) – Updated information regarding locations of newly identified planned developments;</p> <p>l. Section 8.2.1.6 (page 8-35) –Information regarding the potential for conflicts with other construction projects;</p> <p>m. Table 8.2-2 (page 8-36) – Residences and commercial buildings within 50 feet of the Project workspace;</p> <p>n. Section 8.2.2.1 (page 8-37) – Site-specific drawings for all residences within 50 feet of the Project workspace;</p> <p>o. Section 8.3 (page 8-38) – Recently identified public land, recreation, and other designated areas;</p> <p>p. Section 8.3.1.1.1 (page 8-45) – Updated consultations with federal agencies to determine whether federal lands would be impacted by the Project;</p> <p>q. Section 8.3.1.1.2 (page 8-45 to 8-52) – Updated consultations with state agencies;</p> <p>r. Section 8.3.2.1.2 (page 8-61) – Crossing methods of scenic rivers;</p> <p>s. Table 8.3-2 (page 8-62) – Updated list of properties covered under NRCS and Farm Service Agency programs for New Hampshire and Connecticut;</p> <p><b>t. Table 8.3-4 (page 8-80) – New York 480/480A properties located in the vicinity of the Project;</b></p> <p>u. Table 8.3-5 (page 8-88) – Hazardous waste sites for Massachusetts;</p>	<p>j. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>k. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>l. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>m. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>n. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>o. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>p. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>q. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>r. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>s. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p><b>t. Properties identified by Tennessee as crossed by the project are provided in Table 8.3-6. Tennessee will work with landholders to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, as appropriate, to properties protected under the law.</b></p> <p>u. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>t. RRS, Attachment 8b, Table 8.3-6</p>	<p>t. 8b-175 to 8b-190</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>v. Section 8.3.5 (page 8-92) – Information on specialty farm lands identified as crossed by the Project;</p> <p>w. Section 8.4 (page 8-93) – Visual resources discussion for all Project components and special recreation areas; and</p> <p>x. Section 8.6 (page 8-93) – Cumulative impacts associated with land use, recreation, and aesthetics.</p>	<p>v. Tennessee is continuing to conduct environmental surveys, title searches, and consultation with state agencies and landowners to determine the presence of organic and tree farms. Where landowners are affected by the proposed Project, Tennessee will work with these landowners and any of the regulatory or certifying agencies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts and ensure continued enrollment in applicable programs during construction and operation of the Project. This information will be updated as additional survey access is granted.</p> <p>w. The Visual Resources section has been updated.</p> <p>x. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>v. RR8, Section 8.3.4.3 RR8, Table 8.3-8 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>w. RR8, Section 8.4</p>	<p>v. 8-126 to 8-130 8-127 to 8-128</p> <p>w. 8-135 to 8-146</p>
2	<p>General – Revise the land use categories and definitions as listed in Section 8.1 to be consistent with the guidance in Section 8.1 of the FERC Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation. The categories should include agricultural land, forest/woodlands, rangeland, open land, residential land, industrial/commercial land, and open water. Update all discussions and tables that reference land use types to include these land use categories.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
3	<p>Table 8.1-2 – Update the table to include acres of impacts to each land use type by Project Segment (e.g., Pennsylvania to Wright), Project component (e.g., right-of-way, ATWS, access roads, compressor stations), state, and county.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
4	<p>Table 8.1-3 – Update the table to include a column that identifies the existing right-of-way utility that the Project would overlap.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
5	<p>Section 8.1.1.2 (page 8-3) – Identify any locations where looping pipeline would be more than 25 feet from the existing pipeline. Include this information in a separate table, along with an explanation.</p>	<p>Table 1.1-3 has been included.</p>	<p>RR1, Table 1.1-3</p>	<p>1-29 to 1-30</p>
6	<p>Section 8.1.2 (page 8-13) – Include the following information on aboveground facilities:</p> <p>a. specify whether land for aboveground facilities is currently owned or would be acquired by lease or purchase;</p> <p>b. identify all aboveground facilities that would be within the permanent ROW;</p> <p>c. identify how much land surrounding the compressor station sites would be held as a buffer and what the land use would be for the buffer following construction;</p> <p>d. for all new aboveground facilities that would occupy more than 5 acres, consult with the county office of the NRCS to determine the acreage of prime farmland soils that would be affected; and</p> <p>e. consult with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to determine if the new facilities would be within designated floodplain or flood storage areas. Identify mitigation is required.</p>	<p>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>c. Tennessee expects land outside of the compressor station fence line to remain in the existing land use.</p> <p>d. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>e. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>c. RR8, Section 8.4.2.1</p>	<p>c. 8-142 to 8-146</p>
7	<p>Section 8.1.3 (page 8-17) – If additional pipe and contractor yards are unknown or are not yet established, identify the yard requirements, approximate locations, and the anticipated number of additional yards that would be needed.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
8	<p>Table 8.2-1 – Update the table to include all ongoing or planned projects within 0.25 mile of the Project workspace instead of the Project centerline.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
9	<p>Identify any open pit mines or nuclear facilities within ½ mile of the Project facilities.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
10	Table 8.2-2 – Update the table to include all residences, commercial buildings, and structures (e.g., sheds, pools, barns, garages) within 50 feet of construction workspace. Include a column for county and state for each residence, building, and structure.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
11	Section 8.2.2.1 (page 8-37) – Describe how landowners would be notified of construction activities and how hazards from open ditches would be minimized when active construction is not occurring. Describe whether the pipeline centerline would occur within 25 feet of a residence. If this could occur, describe the procedures that would be followed to ensure that the trench would not be excavated until the pipe is ready for installation and that the trench is backfilled immediately after installation.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Section 8.3 (pages 8-38 to 8-93) – Include the results of consultations and coordination with agencies and landowners. For public lands, summarize the status of the negotiations for the special-use permits or right-of-way grants.	All correspondence through October 1, 2015 has been provided in Volume II, Appendix B.	Volume II, Appendix B	N/A
13	Section 8.3 (pages 8-38 to 8-93) – Describe the types of mitigation measures expected to be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts on public lands, recreation areas, and other special land.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
14	Section 8.3 (pages 8-38 to 8-93) – For each special recreation area affected, identify the primary uses, peak use periods, and any seasonal restrictions.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
15	Section 8.3.1.1 (page 8-38) – The text states that “Initial tree felling on these lands will likely occur in the first quarter of 2017” (italics added). Describe what mitigation would be implemented if this schedule is not adhered to.	Tennessee has provided a Winter Construction Plan in the state-specific ECPs.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 12	N/A
16	Section 8.3.4 (page 8-92) – Include details regarding the status and consultations for the coastal zone consistency application for the New York State Department of State.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
17	Identify all conservation lands affected by permanent or temporary right-of-way, identify type, and acres by county.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
18	Section 8.4 (page 8-93) – Include in the visual resources discussion the following details: a. a discussion of visually sensitive areas in the vicinity of pipeline crossings and aboveground facilities; b. use established visual classification systems where appropriate to quantify potential impacts; and c. for all designated or sensitive scenic areas, address mitigation proposed to reduce visual impacts.	The Visual Resources section has been updated.	RR8, Section 8.4	

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 9 - Air and Noise Quality</b>				
1	<p>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 9 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>a. direct and indirect estimated per year criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction of the Project by state; as well as assumptions, data, and emission factors;</p> <p>b. criteria emissions and GHG emissions from construction per year for all nonattainment counties; as well as assumptions, data, and emission factors;</p> <p>c. air emission estimates for the compressor stations for all criteria pollutants, speciated hazardous air pollutants, and greenhouse gases;</p> <p>d. fugitive methane emissions from aboveground facilities (compressor stations, meter/regulation stations, valves, pig launcher/receivers, as well as estimated methane losses from the pipeline per year.</p> <p>e. dispersion modeling to estimate air concentrations resulting from compressor stations, and demonstration of compliance with the NAAQS;</p> <p>f. discussion on air regulatory requirements to which the Project would be subject;</p>	<p>a. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p>c. Emission rates in tons per year have been provided in tables for each new compressor station. Emission calculations are included in Attachment 9b to Resource Report 9. Additional details on the air emission sources for the compressor stations, including the basis for emission rates and calculations, and the dispersion modeling analyses are provided in the air permit applications Attachment 9c.</p> <p>d. Combustion of fossil fuels and fugitive emissions during Project construction and operation will result in the emission of the following greenhouse gases: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O).</p> <p>e. An overview of the dispersion modeling analysis and a comparison of the results to significant impact levels and National Ambient Air Quality Standards is provided in Resource Report 9. The requested details on the dispersion modeling methodology and inputs are provided in modeling reports provided to the state agencies to support the air permit applications.</p> <p>f. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>	<p>c. RR9, Table 9.1-17 RR9, Tables 9.1-20 through 9.1-23 RR9, Tables 9.1-29 through 9.1-31 RR9, Table 9.1-35 RR9, Attachment 9b RR9, Attachment 9c d. RR9, Section 9.1.2.4 e. RR9, Section 9.1.3 RR9, Attachment 9c</p>	<p>c. 9-34 9-37 to 9-40 9-48 to 9-50 9-56 Attachment 9b Attachment 9c d. 9-23 to 9-24 e. 9-30 to 9-65</p>
	<p>g. ambient noise surveys for each compressor station location and meter stations (meter stations with homes within ½ mile);</p> <p>h. acoustical analysis to determine the noise contribution at each NSA for each compressor stations;</p> <p>i. construction noise impacts at compressor stations and meter and regulation stations at nearest NSAs;</p> <p>j. compressor station noise mitigation requirements;</p>	<p>g. Baseline noise surveys were conducted at all nine of the new compressor station sites to determine noise sensitive areas (“NSAs”) and the existing sound levels, in decibels (dBA) day-night average sound levels, (L<sub>dn</sub>) at each NSA. Attachment 9a, Figure 9.2-1 through Figure 9.2-10, show the distances and directions of the NSAs to the respective compressor stations. Baseline noise survey results for each compressor station are summarized and presented in data tables. The details of these baseline sound surveys are included as attachments to Resource Report 9.</p> <p>h. Acoustical Assessment Reports with the requested information are included for each compressor station site as attachments to Resource Report 9. Manufacturer’s name and model number will be determined during detailed design and procurement. NSA distances and directions in relation to the compressor stations are provided on the Figures in Attachment 9a.</p> <p>i. Noise associated with Project construction activities will be intermittent and temporary. Construction equipment will be operated on an as-needed basis and mostly during daylight hours. Construction noise of varying magnitude and duration will occur at all Project locations. The most prevalent sound source during construction is anticipated to be the internal combustion engines used to provide mobility and operating power to construction equipment.</p> <p>j. An acoustical analysis was performed to determine the estimated compressor station noise contribution at each NSA for all compressor stations. Noise mitigation requirements were determined during the analysis to determine how each compressor station will meet regulatory requirements. Noise mitigation for each compressor station is detailed in the corresponding compressor station reports.</p>	<p>g. RR9, Attachments 9d through 9n RR9, Attachment 9a, Figures 9.2-1 through 9.2-10 h. RR9, Attachments 9d through 9n RR9, Attachment 9a, Figures 9.2-1 through 9.2-10 i. RR9, Section 9.2.4 j. RR9, Attachments 9d through 9n</p>	<p>g. Attachments 9d-9n Attachment 9a h. Attachments 9d-9n Attachment 9a i. 9-96 to 9-100 j. Attachments 9d-9n</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>k. applicable state and local noise ordinances at compressor station locations;</p> <p><b>l. proposed modifications or proposed equipment at all meter and regulation stations;</b></p> <p>m. location of all HDD sites, ambient noise survey and the noise impacts of these locations with NSAs within ½ mile; and length of time of drill;</p> <p>n. noise survey and acoustical analysis at each HDD entry and exit site;</p> <p>o. noise mitigation requirements for each meter station, including baseline noise surveys;</p> <p>p. blowdown silencer performance targets along with estimated sound level contribution at each NSA; and</p> <p>q. discussion of the Project's cumulative analysis as identified in our February 27, 2015 comment letter.</p>	<p>k. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p> <p><b>l. With proposed noise control treatments, the station noise contributions attributable to the proposed equipment at all of the nearest NSAs will be below the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") criterion of 55 dBA Ldn. Final noise control treatments will be determined during final design.</b></p> <p>m. An acoustical analysis will be performed to determine the estimated HDD noise contribution at each NSA for all entry and exit sites. Noise mitigation requirements will be determined during the analysis to determine how each HDD site will meet regulatory requirements.</p> <p>n. An acoustical analysis will be performed to determine the estimated HDD noise contribution at each NSA for all entry and exit sites. Noise mitigation requirements will be determined during the analysis to determine how each HDD site will meet regulatory requirements.</p> <p>o. With proposed noise control treatments, the station noise contributions attributable to the proposed equipment at all of the nearest NSAs will be below the FERC criterion of 55 dBA Ldn. Final noise control treatments will be determined during final design.</p> <p>p. Venting silencer performance targets have been determined and are presented in Table 9.2 27, along with the estimated short-term sound level contribution, Leq dBA, at the most-impacted NSAs for each station.</p> <p>q. A discussion on cumulative impacts associated with air and noise has been provided.</p>	<p>l. RR9, Section 9.2.3.2</p> <p>m. RR9, Section 9.2.5</p> <p>n. RR9, Section 9.2.5</p> <p>o. RR9, Section 9.2.3.2</p> <p>p. RR9, Table 9.2-27</p> <p>q. RR9, Section 9.2.7</p>	<p>l. 9-94 to 9-96</p> <p>m. 9-100</p> <p>n. 9-100</p> <p>o. 9-94 to 9-96</p> <p>p. 9-101</p> <p>q. 9-101 to 9-103</p>
2	Section 9.1, Table 9.1-1 (page 9-2) – Include the ambient air quality standard for lead, and both 1997 and 2008 standards for ozone.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	Section 9.1.1.2 (pages 9-5 to 9-8) – Update the existing ambient air quality discussion to include the distance and direction to the cited monitoring stations from each compressor station.	The existing ambient air quality discussion has been revised.	RR9, Section 9.1.1.2	9-7 to 9-19
4	Section 9.1.1.2 (pages 9-9 to 9-12) – Verify whether or not there are any maintenance areas in the Project area and for which pollutant. If there are maintenance areas in the Project area, include a discussion of provisions that would be applicable within the maintenance area, or verify that no related provisions would apply to the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Section 9.1.2.1 (page 9-13) – Include the distance to the nearest federal Class I area from each compressor station, and discuss potential impacts and mitigation.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	Section 9.1.2.5.5 (page 9-21) – Include a discussion of any Connecticut state air quality provisions for construction emissions.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Section 9.1.3.1 (page 9-21) – Verify whether or not there would be open burning. If so, include emissions estimates in construction emissions.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	Section 9.1.3.3 (page 9-25) – Include construction emissions by county for all maintenance or nonattainment areas.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
9	Section 9.2.2 (page 9-32) – Include identification of NSA's within one mile of each compressor station.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
10	Section 9.2.2.2.1 (page 9-32) – When conducting the acoustical analysis for existing conditions at the existing compressor station, ensure that the existing compressors are operating at full load.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
11	Section 9.2.4 (page 9-67) – Include methods to mitigate noise and vibration impacts on NSAs in the Project Blasting Plan.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	Section 9.2.6 (page 9-73) – Include a description of the likelihood of a pipeline blowdown event. This discussion should include the cause and frequency of a blowdown event, the approximate time it would take to evacuate gas from the pipeline, and the potential noise associated with the MLV based on the nearest NSA's distance from the noise source.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
13	13. Provide an air quality screening (AERSCREEN) or refined analysis (AERMOD or EPA-approved alternative) of the Station 319 compressor station demonstrating that the incremental increase in emissions of criteria pollutants do not result in local exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); state ambient air quality standards; or cause or contribute to additional violations of the NAAQS. This modeling should: a. identify existing emission rates of criteria pollutants from the station, and provide modeling results to identify existing local impact levels of criteria pollutants; and b. identify proposed emission rates of criteria pollutants from the station and provide modeling results to identify the local impacts of the new turbines in addition to the existing equipment at the compressor station. c. Include all input parameters (emission rate, stack height, stack temperature, exit velocity, etc.) and justify bases for any assumptions. Provide a narrative describing and justifying the modeling basis, and all inputs (meteorological data, terrain data). For any mitigation measures, or air pollution control equipment, provide data to justify control efficiency. Provide output data showing maximum impacts outside the fence line (the EPA-defined ambient air boundary), and at sensitive receptors in the area (schools, hospitals, nursing homes, etc.).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Resource Report 10 - Alternatives</b>				
1	General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 10 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: a. locations and details for alternative compressor station, meter station, mainline valves, and contractor yard sites; b. additional evaluation of major and minor route alternatives, and minor route deviations; and c. information regarding Article 97 properties, including information from state agencies.	a. Alternative sites for Compressor Stations have been provided. An alternatives comparative analysis was not conducted for MLVs and meter stations. Tennessee complied with Department of Transportation (“DOT”) requirements for these types of facilities and chose the best available site within the allowable area as per DOT requirements. Upon completion of the survey and consultation process, Tennessee will further evaluate the potential locations and make determinations on which yards will be used. The alternatives analysis for the contractor yard sites will be based on environmental and land use impacts, as well as land availability and temporary easement acquisitions. b. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing. c. Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.	a. RR10, Section 10.5 RR10, Section 10.6 RR10, Section 10.7	a. 10-101 to 10-113 10-113 to 10-115 10-115 to 10-116
2	Section 10.1 (page 10-2) – List the “other shippers” mentioned in Section 10.1.	Negotiations continue with additional Project Shippers for both the Supply Path and Market Path Components of the Project. Information regarding the “other shippers” will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR10, Section 10.1 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	10-1 to 10-3
3	Section 10.1 (page 10-2) – Include an evaluation of the facilities, equipment, and processes that would be required to transport a Project-equivalent volume of natural gas from the supply area to the destination locations via alternative modes such as truck and rail.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	Section 10.3 (page 10-14) – Include data categories in all alternatives comparison tables for streams with drinking water use designation, important bird areas, and Audubon forest blocks of importance.	The tables have been updated with information requested in DR2. Streams with drinking water designation, Important Bird Areas, and Audubon forest blocks of importance are included in all tables.	RR10, Section 10.3	10-22 to 10-100

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
5	Section 10.3.1 (page 10-25) – Include a detailed analysis specifically assessing alternative crossing locations for the Appalachian Trail to minimize impacts.	A new section, 10.3.4, was added to discuss alternate crossing locations of the Trail. Consultations were conducted with the Massachusetts Appalachian Trail Committee. A trail-crossing plan is included in the ECPs.	RR10, Section 10.3.4 Volume II, Appendices J, M, and N, Attachment 13 Volume II, Appendices K and L, Attachment 14	10-99 to 10-100
6	Section 10.3.1.8 (page 10-40) –Describe potential impact avoidance (such as HDD), minimization, and mitigation measures that could be used to address impacts to Article 97 properties.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Figure 10.2-5 and Figure 10.3-5 – Add the Portland Natural Gas System (and other applicable figures), and clarify a potential mapping error for Figures 10.3-5 and 10.3-7 (the alternative routes depicted appear to be identical).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	Provide a discussion of the feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed new compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity required and the number of electric motors required. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required for the electric motors.	The feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed new compressor stations has been provided.	RR10, Section 10.5.3	10-109 to 10-113
9	Include in a table similar to table 10.3-10, a comprehensive list, assessment, and conclusion for all stakeholder-requested minor route deviations filed at any time in the pre-filing docket. Also include in the list any stakeholder comments where a minor route deviation may not be specifically requested, but where a specific resource concern (e.g., Project proximity to a home, well, spring, wetland, future residential development, etc.) is identified that would potentially benefit from a resource avoidance/impact minimization analysis by Tennessee Gas. Evaluate routing, workspace, and construction method alternatives as appropriate. The analysis should be based on direct stakeholder discussions and on-site evaluations, if the landowner is willing, and on available desktop imagery and data if landowner access is denied. At a minimum, the table should include columns for tract/parcel number, segment identification and milepost, description of the requested minor route deviation, Tennessee Gas's assessment of and conclusion for the minor route deviation (including adequate descriptive text as well as comparison tables and maps where appropriate), and a statement regarding whether the stakeholder's routing concerns have been resolved. Also, provide an identical table listing stakeholder routing and/or resource avoidance concerns reported to Tennessee Gas, but which do not appear within comments filed to the PF docket.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
10	Identify any structural or engineering changes on the existing 200 Line, that could accommodate all or a portion of the NED planned gas volumes. This may include, but should not be limited to: additional compression, pipeline uprates, replacements, looping or a combination of these.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
11	<p>Prepare additional environmental, engineering, and economic analysis of the (1) Existing Line 200 Alternative combined with the New York Alternative and (2) Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative combined with the New York Alternative. The analysis should include the following information so that a quantitative comparison can be made with Tennessee Gas' planned route:</p> <p>a. identify the total length of each pipeline alternative in miles;</p> <p>b. the temporary and permanent acreage impacted by land use/vegetation type;</p> <p>c. identify the number of contiguous forest tracts greater than 100 feet long;</p> <p>d. identify the number of landowners affected;</p> <p>e. identify threatened and endangered species critical habitat that the pipeline would traverse, or would be within ¼ mile of the right-of-way;</p> <p>f. the number of residents within 50 feet of the edge of the construction ROW;</p> <p>g. identify the number of Major rivers ( greater than 100 feet); Intermediate streams/rivers (between 10-100 feet); number of warm water and cold water fisheries; and wild and scenic rivers;</p> <p>h. delineate the wetland linear feet and acreage by wetland type, identify those dominated by exotic non-native species;</p> <p>i. identify what facilities are defined as "environmental hazards". Narrow the focus radius to ¼ mile around the pipeline ROW.</p> <p>j. identify mines, quarries, and other geological hazards within ¼ mile of the pipeline ROW;</p> <p>k. identify any scenic areas, or historic viewsheds that the alternatives would cross;</p> <p>l. provide information for evaluation of environmental justice concerns such as: low-income populations, minority populations, or tribal communities;</p> <p>m. identify the number, relative locations, and horsepower of compressor stations that would be required for the alternative;</p> <p>n. identify on a map what laterals would be required to meet delivery points, if different than the planned current laterals; and</p> <p>o. Provide mapping of each alternative using the most up to date U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute-series topographic maps with mileposts; maps from the Massachusetts Office of Geographic Information (MASSGIS) system; and current aerial photography..</p> <p>The above information should include all assumptions, (ex. 50 foot permanent ROW, overlap with existing ROW, etc.)</p>	Tennessee has evaluated two additional major route alternatives using readily available public databases: (1) Combined New York and Existing Line 200 Alternative and (2) Combined New York and Mass Turnpike Alternative.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.2.7 and Section 10.3.1.2.8	10-55 to 10-63
<b>Resource Report 11 - Reliability and Safety</b>				
1	General – Include all information listed in Resource Report 11 as pending or "TBD" (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to US DOT class locations and high consequence areas.	All information listed as TBD has been addressed.	RR11	RR 11
2	Section 11.2.1 (page 11-2) – Describe how Tennessee Gas would monitor for changes in population density around the pipeline. If population density changes such that higher classification standards of safety must be met, discuss how and when Tennessee Gas would be required to meet the new standards.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	Section 11.2 (page 11-2) – Describe any Project safety features that would result in facilities or measures that are more stringent than required by the U.S. Department of Transportation.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
4	Section 11.2.1 (page 11-4) – Clarify whether each of the MLVs would be automated and/or remotely controlled.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	Section 11.2.2 (page 11-6) – Specify each segment of the Project’s mainline pipeline and laterals that would have odorized gas, and identify the odorization location.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	Section 11.2.5 (page 11-7) – Describe the location of Tennessee Gas’s area offices along the Project facilities which can provide a “quick response to any emergency situations” and indicate what the expected maximum response times would be. Further, clarify if these personnel would be available at all times.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	In responding to landowner concerns, indicate whether Tennessee Gas would voluntarily construct the pipeline to a higher US DOT Class location category in any area where a residence would be within the potential impact radius.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
<b>Volume II Appendix F - Alignment Sheets</b>				
1	The following are general inconsistencies in the alignment sheets: a. Overhead transmission lines are not documented on map; and b. In general, there are several instances where the proposed access roads do not intersect with the ROW or centerline of the Project. These have been identified as roads that were likely used for the Constitution or adjacent projects. Lengths and acreages (as well as display on maps) should be adjusted to show full extent and connection with new ROW for the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
2	The following are inconsistencies between Table 2.3-1 and the alignment sheets: a. Wetland BD-K-W008 (PFO) at MP 8.46 is labeled in the alignment sheet as “Wetland.” Please add Wetland ID to the label in the alignment sheet. b. Wetland BD-K-W004 does not appear to be impacted in the alignment sheet, but appears in Table 2.3-1. Please confirm.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
3	In Table 2.3-1, Wetland BD-M-W008-PEM is labeled as BD-M-W008.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
4	Please identify the two “unknown” wetlands in Table 2.3-3 in Segment F at MP 21.28 and 21.48.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
5	The NWI wetland at MP 22.3 in Segment F in the alignment sheet does not have a wetland ID and does not appear in Table 2.3-3.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
6	Wetland AL-D-W026 appears in the alignment sheet as being impacted by ATWS, but does not appear in Table 2.3-3.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
7	Identify “unknown” wetland in Table 2.3-3 in Segment F at MP 26.89.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
8	Wetland RE-L-W002 does not appear to be impacted in the alignment sheet, but appears in Table 2.3-3. Please confirm.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
9	Wetland NWI-157 does not appear to be impacted in the alignment sheet, but appears in Table 2.3-5. There is a wetland with no ID being impacted at approximately the same point that does not appear in Table 2.3-5. Please confirm.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
10	The ‘Begin Milepost’ values for NWI-616 and NWI-617 for Segment K are incorrect.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
11	Wetland NWI-619 does not appear to be impacted in the Alignment Sheet, but appears in Table 2.3-5. Please confirm.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
12	The pages in the alignment sheets for Segment P are out of order.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
13	Wetland NWI-755 in Table 2.3-5 beginning at MP 4.25 is labeled as Wetland NWI-751 in the alignment sheets. Please address this discrepancy.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
14	An NWI wetland appears to be impacted by the ATWS at the end of Segment Q, but is not labeled and does not appear in Table 2.3-5.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
15	There are a number of NWI wetlands that are impacted by workspaces but are not labeled with a unique ID and do not appear in Table 2.3-7.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
16	Wetland WI-P-W002 at MP 13.67 of Segment S does not appear in Table 2.3-9.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
17	Update the alignment sheets to include the following information regarding ATWSs: a. all ATWSs should be labeled with a unique identifier, as listed in Table 8.1-4; b. depict the full dimensions of each ATWS in the alignment sheets consistent with what is listed in Table 8.1-4;	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		
18	The following are inconsistencies between Table 8.1-7 and the alignment sheets: a. Segment B: "AR 23 - TGP 300" does not connect to an existing road or other feature and is viewed as hanging out in empty space. Update to connect to existing infrastructure and update length and acreage; b. Segment C: i. "AR 34 - CON" does not connect to an existing road. Update to connect to existing road surfaces and update length and acreage accordingly; ii. "AR 36 - CON" and "AR 37 - CON" are in close proximity. Verify that both features would be utilized; c. Segment D: i. "AR 72 - CON" is listed in the table but not shown on map; ii. "AR 73 - CON" extends past ROW. Verify length and acreages to ensure that only required distance is represented and update alignment sheet; d. Segment E: "AR 98 - CON" shown on table but not found in the alignment sheets; e. Segment F: i. "AR 109 - TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area; ii. "AR 110 - TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area; iii. "AR 111 - TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area; iv. "AR 118A - TGP 200" does seem necessary since it overlays an existing road "Pitcher Lane." Confirm that the road would be utilized; v. "AR 124 - TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area;	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.		



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>vi. "AR 134 – TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area;</p> <p>vii. "AR 135A – TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area;</p> <p>viii. "AR 139A – TGP 200" does not connect with ROW centerline. Update and revise length and acreage accordingly so that the road reaches the construction area;</p> <p>f. Segment S: "AR 317A – TGP 300" and "AR 317B – TGP 300" are occurring on opposite sides of the ROW at the same MP. Confirm that both options would be utilized; and</p> <p>g. Segment T: "AR 323 – TGP 300" extends past ROW. Verify length and acreages to ensure that only required distance is represented and update alignment sheet.</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
<p>19</p>	<p>The following are inconsistencies between Table 8.1-9 and the alignment sheets:</p> <p>a. Segment A:</p> <p>i. General – Driveways are not consistently identified in the table or in the alignment sheets;</p> <p>ii. "Unknown Road" at MP 2.57 identified in table, but not in the alignment sheets;</p> <p>iii. Apparent unidentified crossing near MP 22.7. Feature is visible in imagery but identified in table or in alignment sheets;</p> <p>b. Segment B:</p> <p>i. "Private Road" near "AR 25 – TGP 300" is not identified in the table;</p> <p>ii. General – Driveways are not consistently identified in the table or in the alignment sheets;</p> <p>c. Segment C:</p> <p>i. Crossing of "Driveway" at MP 2.21 reported in table but no identification in the alignment sheets;</p> <p>ii. Driveway crossed at MP 8.6 not identified in table or in the alignment sheets but is visible in imagery;</p> <p>iii. "Road No. 171" crossed at MP 34.9 identified in the alignment sheets but not found in table;</p> <p>d. Segment D:</p> <p>i. Driveway crossed at MP 11.5 not identified in table or in alignment sheets but is visible in imagery;</p> <p>ii. Second crossing of "Bundy Hollow Road" at MP 23.25 visible in the alignment sheet but not identified in table;</p> <p>iii. Driveway crossed near MP 40.0 not identified, but visible in imagery;</p>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Driveways crossed at MP 14.0,18.7, 21.2, 37.9 are not identified in the alignment sheets or table but are visible in imagery;</li> <li>iv. "Existing Road" crossed at MP 20.1 not identified in table;</li> <li>v. "Driveway" crossed at MP 33.8 not identified in the alignment sheet;</li> <li>vi. "Mud Pond Road" crossing at MP 41.31 not identified in the alignment sheet;</li> <li>g. Segment G:</li> <li>i. Driveway crossed at MP 8.5 is visible on imagery but identified in table or in the alignment sheets;</li> <li>ii. "Plains RD" crossing at MP 13.47 not identified in the alignment sheets;</li> <li>h. Segment I:</li> <li>i. "Stone Mountain Road" and "Attleboro Road" feature not clearly visible in the alignment sheets;</li> <li>ii. "Unknown Road" crossings at MP 13.5 and 19.2 not identified in table;</li> <li>i. Segment J:</li> <li>i. Due to error in the table, the crossings listed for MP 1.99, 2.06 and 2.2 need to be removed;</li> <li>ii. Crossing at MP 1.63 needs to be attributed to "NH-124";</li> <li>iii. "Unknown Road" crossings at MP 14.8 and 16.5 are not identified in table;</li> <li>iv. "Thoreau LN" crossing at MP 18.32 not shown in the alignment sheets;</li> <li>v. Remove "Unknown Road Crossings" at MP 19.00 and 18.94;</li> <li>vi. Add "Hertzgar DR" crossing at MP 18.95;</li> <li>vii. "Existing Road" crossing at MP 22.5 not shown in table;</li> <li>viii. Driveways need to be identified throughout;</li> <li>ix. "Greens Pond Drive" crossing at MP 24.71 not identified in the alignment sheets;</li> </ul>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>x. "Unknown Road" crossing at MP 35.6 not identified in table;</li> <li>j. Segment N:</li> <li>i. "Snowberry Road" crossing at MP 0.19 needs better identification of the feature</li> <li>ii. "Cecilia Cr" crossing at MP 1.83 not identified in the alignment sheets;</li> <li>k. Segment P:</li> <li>i. Sheets in provided PDF are out of order;</li> <li>l. Segment Q:</li> <li>i. Driveway crossing at MP 10.90 not identified in the alignment sheets or in table, but clearly visible in imagery;</li> <li>m. Segment R:</li> <li>i. "West Berlin RD" crossing at MP 1.15 not identified in table;</li> <li>ii. Driveway crossings at MP 1.15 and 1.16 not identified in the alignment sheets; and</li> <li>iii. "Existing Road" crossing at MP 11.8 not identified in table.</li> </ul>	<p>Addressed in the July 24, 2015 filing.</p>		

**Responses to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Comments on Draft Resource Reports, May 15, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>General Comments</b>				
1	<p><b>Co-location</b></p> <p>The resource reports explain that a significant portion of the proposed NED pipeline will be co-located with other utility rights of way as a means to reduce Project impacts. This approach has merit and should be fully considered. Additional information should be provided in the resource reports in both plan view and tabular format to clearly depict the overall (net) change in ROW width along the proposed Project segments to be co-located. Plan views, with sections along the entire corridor would improve understanding of potential impacts (and impact avoidance) including tree clearing/forest fragmentation, and impacts to wetlands, etc. The discussion in Resource Report 10 (page 10-15) notes that the new pipeline would be placed 5' outside of existing utility easements to reduce impacts. Is this the case for all co-located segments? We request that the Resource Reports (and ultimately the EIS) provide information for the entire Project area to explain the width of the existing ROW, how much of the ROW is currently cleared, and how much more the ROW will be expanded/widened (cleared) as a result of the proposed co-location (Table 1.1-2). Again, section views in representative co-located sections will be helpful in this regard.</p> <p>The discussion of co-location at 10-15 and elsewhere begs the question whether co-location at any point along the proposed pipeline alignment will lead to a violation of commitments made or the spirit of previously approved pipelines. For example, if previous approvals included limits on the right of way width to avoid fragmentation/habitat impacts these approvals should be discussed in the co-location discussion.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
2	<p><b>Compressor Stations</b></p> <p>Resource Reports 1 and 10 note that final locations for compressor stations have not been determined. This makes it difficult to offer comments. We note that this is a big data gap in an area of great public interest. When this information is developed it should be accompanied by a thorough evaluation including distances to abutters and sensitive receptors as well as potential impacts, including air, noise and lighting impacts, and mitigation measures to address those impacts. The analysis also notes that compressor stations require 10 acres of land for operation. It would be helpful if the report included the basis for that assumption and a discussion whether impacts from compressor station operation could be further minimized with additional land. A similar question applies to metering stations and how the suggested area standards were developed.</p>	Compressor Station locations and site plans, which includes acreages, have been provided. Noise sensitive area distances and directions in relation to the compressor stations are provided on the Figures in Attachment 9a.	Volume II, Appendix R RR9, Attachment 9a, Figures 9.2-1 through 9.2-10	Attachment 9a
3	<p><b>Safety Monitoring</b></p> <p>Resource Report 1 (at 1-122) describes remote safety monitoring of the pipeline through Tennessee information and software networks. The resource report should describe whether Tennessee could crosslink their safety network with applicable emergency responders in the host communities to improve response times in emergency situations.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
4	<p><b>Lack of Property Access for Survey Purposes</b> The percentage of “no access” reported in the Resource Report 1 (at 1-51) is meaningful and presents barriers to the accurate characterization of potential environmental impacts. Waiting to collect relevant Project information until after the close of the NEPA process (after the FERC certificate is issued) is one potential strategy but is far from ideal. EPA is concerned about the amount of desktop analysis that will be used and whether it will allow for impact characterization that accurately informs future permit reviews. Moreover, the lack of specific Project information for the pipeline alignment is compounded along the co-located segment adjacent to the proposed Constitution Pipeline where property access constraints have already limited on-the-ground surveys. Ideally, specific Project related information will be developed for this co-located portion of the alignment and presented in the resource reports and EIS for the Project.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	<p><b>Alternatives Discussion</b> The narrative discussion of system alternatives in 10.2 and other systems in 10.2.2 would benefit from incorporation of an overall plan showing the locations of all existing pipeline infrastructure owned by Tennessee and other companies, existing capacities, and the degree to which those pipelines are at capacity. This information would help describe whether upgrades/expansions of existing systems owned by the Project proponent and others could meet the Project purpose.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
6	<p><b>Constitution Pipeline</b> Resource Report 10 (at 10-11) discusses the Constitution Pipeline and notes that the Constitution FEIS “...acknowledges that construction of one larger pipeline rather than two smaller pipelines [if Constitution and NED were to share a pipeline] will generally reduce long-term environmental impacts...” It also indicates, “Commission staff states that were it to recommend that Constitution construct a larger diameter pipeline, that recommendation will directly conflict with the Commission’s established policy on overbuilding.” We question whether this conclusion is as definitive as the discussion suggests based on the market need information presented to support both projects. That same information describes a market where the need for additional capacity is great. The potential impact reduction benefits of a shared pipeline should not be so readily discounted, even if the coordination between two project applicants is difficult or complicated. We believe delays to the Constitution Project due to lawsuits and survey access speak to keeping the dialogue about a combined pipeline alignment (through what is now the proposed co-located Constitution/NED corridor) alive during the analysis of the NED Project.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
7	<p><b>Water Supply Well Testing</b> Resource Report 1 (at 1-76) states that Tennessee may test water wells within 150 feet of the construction workspace, both before and after construction. As the use of the term “may” is ambiguous the report should be modified to explain the conditions under which Tennessee wouldn’t test. We also believe the 150 foot criteria should be extended where there is reason to believe that work may affect a larger area (e.g. where a drinking water well is downgradient of a work area).</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
8	<p><b>Natural Gas Requirements in New England</b>            The Competitive Energy Services February 2014 Report "Natural Gas Supply Assessing Natural Gas Supply Options for New England and their Impacts on Natural Gas and Electricity Prices" concluded that "2 bcf/d of additional pipeline capacity is required to eliminate the natural gas price differential between New England and pricing points to the region's west and south. The additional 1 bcf/d above that proposed in the Governors' Letter will provide the region's electricity consumers \$600 million a year in reduced costs beyond the savings they will realize as a result of the 1 bcf/d incremental capacity proposed in the Governors' Letter. This represents a 1 to 3 year payback period on the incremental pipeline investment, depending on the sequencing of the pipeline expansions."            ISO New England president and CEO Gordon van Welie told reporters in January 2015 that "New England needs an additional 1.1 to 1.6 billion cubic feet of additional daily pipeline capacity to fuel the region's current natural gas generators during periods of peak demand, which occur on about 40 cold winter days per year...".            According to the FERC EIS for the Constitution Project—Constitution will yield approximately .65 bcf/day, Spectra AIM will transport approximately .34 bcf/day, and Spectra's Atlantic Bridge will transport approximately .22 bcf/day. NED is proposed to provide 2.2 bcf/day. In addition, Access Northeast states it will "funnel" an additional 1 billion cubic feet/day.            Based on this information we believe more information should be provided to explain expected requirements for natural gas in New England over the next few years. The resource reports should further explain whether a combination of other proposed and ongoing projects fulfill the same capacity need as NED.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
9	<p><b>Stormwater Management</b>            Resource Report 1 (at 1-184) states that Tennessee will install silt fences and/or hay bales around disturbed areas, as appropriate to the land, soil and weather conditions, to minimize the potential for erosion and impacts to off-site wetlands and water bodies and that erosion and sediment controls will conform to Tennessee's Project-specific ECPs for each state. Tennessee should consider the use of more effective best management practices, particularly where run-off could affect sensitive or impaired water bodies and wetlands. Many new stormwater best management practices have been developed in recent years.</p>	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
10	<p><b>Environmental Justice Analysis</b>            Resource Report 1 (at 1-143) refers to the socioeconomic analysis at the county level. We have found that environmental justice analysis is more meaningful and less likely to mask potential impacts when conducted at the municipal level, as EJ populations can vary dramatically at the county level. Evaluating EJ impacts at the municipal provides a more precise screen for EJ populations and the localized impacts they may suffer. EPA has a tool that evaluates EJ populations at the municipal level in New England. We are willing to assist with this evaluation as time and resources allow.</p>	The Environmental Justice analysis has been updated as requested.	RR5, Section 5.9	5-19 to 5-23

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Specific Comments on Resource Reports</b>				
1	RR1, Page 1-11. First paragraph. Please discuss the “backhaul” on Tennessee’s existing 200 line system, and how that increases capacity.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
2	RR1 – Table 1.0-1 – Is the designation “3” after the Loop number, a descriptor indicating the third loop of pipeline in that area? If so, describe when the previous loop was constructed, and discuss whether replacement of the original pipeline with a larger pipeline is less environmentally damaging, and would need fewer compressors than the Project proposal.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
3	RR1 – 1.1.2.3.2 – Compressor stations from the Constitution Pipeline should be listed as well.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
4	RR-1 Table 1.1-4 – Please explain why the Table shows more capacity associated with pipeline segments than the total Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	RR-1 Table 1.2-1 This table should indicate area taken for NED, and the area taken for Constitution. This information will be helpful in the assessment of cumulative impacts, as well.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
6	RR 10.1.2.1. The report states that wind power is not an option for providing for existing or projected power needs in the Project area. The resource reports should describe any wind power projects in the Project area contributing to local energy demands. We also request that the contributions of the Anbaric Transmission’s Vermont Green Line and Maine Green Line be incorporated into the discussion.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
7	RR10.2.1. As discussed on the second FERC sponsored interagency “western” phone call, please provide a map, and table of all of the pipeline upgrade, loops, etc. to the Tennessee pipeline system in PA, NY, CT, MA, and NH and discuss if any of these upgrades are related to, or could replace the NED. This information request is also described in the alternatives section above.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
8	Table 10.3-4 – Provide Verification of impacts on Existing 200 line alternative. Tree and woodland losses should be included in all impact tables to reflect vegetation management that will be in effect for the life to the Project. Comparisons of habitat quality between impacts from the proposed alternative and the 200 line alternative should be made. The Table also uses the term “environmental hazards”, and appears to use this as reason why the 200 line alternative may not be ideal. This term should be more fully explained as most of the environmental hazards appear to be gas stations and it is unclear how these present a danger to the pipeline. Also, disturbed land containing landfills and quarries along the route may represent an opportunity to avoid impacts thorough colocation.	Additional analysis of the Existing 200 Line has been provided.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.2.3 RR10, Table 10.3-5	10-43 to 10-46 10-46
9	RR10.3.1.1.2. EPA continues to disagree that the I-88 Alternative received sufficient review and analysis in the previous review of the Constitution Project. This alternative, or any hybrid alternatives that can be collocated with I-88 should be analyzed to determine if it can be constructed or operated with fewer impacts than the proposed alternative.	The I-88 Alternative and I-88 Hybrid Alignment Alternative have been discussed.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.1.2 RR10, Section 10.3.1.1.3	10-31 to 10-32 10-32 to 10-37



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
10	RR10.3.1.1.3 The discussion in the resource report should be expanded to explain why the NEEEX route is not viable even though it was used for the Constitution Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
11	RR10.3.1.2 We recommend that Table 10.3 include two other factors: wetlands being crossed by HDD or bored crossings (as compared to dry crossings) and interior forest impacts.	Tables have been updated.	RR10, Section 10.3	10-22 to 10-100
<b>Resource Report #1</b>				
1	Page 1-27: The resource report should compare energy usage, emissions and noise between proposed compressor stations to the baseline condition (which would include any existing machinery or compressor/metering station emissions).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
2	Page 1-77: Historical and regular agricultural lands should be mapped. The analysis should discuss agricultural land affected during construction of the Project and long-term management of the Project.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
3	Page 1-121: The analysis should discuss the frequency of pipeline inspections and the environmental effects from related truck traffic/inspection equipment.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
<b>Resource Report #2</b>				
4	Page 2-3: The analysis should explain why .25 miles was used in the search of the dataset report for groundwater hazards.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	Page 2-4: It would be helpful if a map was provided with section 2.1.1.2.1 showing all the aquifers along the Project route.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
6	Page 2-15: The analysis should discuss potential effects on wells on farms and other properties adjacent to the Project.	Tennessee is currently in the process of identifying and compiling information on the location of private drinking water wells and springs within 200 feet of any Project workspace area. As well information becomes available, the data will be updated and will be submitted in the Final ER.	RR2, Att 2b, Tbl 2.1-2 and 2.1-3	2b-1 to 2b-20
7	Page 2-30: "Unknown Crossings" in Table 2.2-2 should be more clearly defined.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
8	Page 2-79: More information about hydrostatic pressure testing should be provided.	Hydrostatic test water fill locations and quantity of water needed have been provided. Discharge locations will be dependent on local permit requirements and will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR2, Table 2.2-9 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	2-47 to 2-50

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
9	Page 2-89: The timeline for pipeyards and access roads should be described in greater detail. The description should include potential affects from these storage yards, how long they will be used, and measures that will be taken to restore occupied areas once they are no longer needed.	Tennessee has identified 198 contractor yards for the proposed Project. The contractor yards are typically sited in existing fields, existing paved lots, or other previously disturbed areas and will not require any modifications to the existing land use. Tennessee has sited these facilities outside of wetlands to the extent practicable. Tennessee has identified access roads for use during construction and operations and is in the process of obtaining permission for the use of private access roads. Access roads identified include temporary roads that have been previously utilized on former Tennessee projects, those approved for use during construction of the Constitution Pipeline Project, and additional access roads identified by Tennessee. Tennessee has sited these facilities outside of sensitive resources to the extent practicable. Locations of proposed contractor yards and access roads are depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute topographic maps and aerial alignment sheets.	RR2, Section 2.2.4 RR2, Section 2.3.4 RR2, Section 2.3.3 Volume II, Appendices E and F	2-39 2-87 to 2-88 2-87
10	Page 2-104: Table 2.3-1, Wetlands Associated with the Project in PA. Do the totals provided include pipeyards, access roads, and compressor stations even though these sites have not been determined? How were these acreages calculated?	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		

**Responses to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Comments on Draft Resource Reports, May 15, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
1	Section 3.1.1.2, New York Fisheries – Game and commercial species are listed but there are many other fish species not mentioned in this section which are vitally important for aquatic ecosystem health. Many species found in the Hudson River and its tributaries are not listed here but should be added. A more comprehensive list should be provided. This list can be obtained from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. They may also have GIS data that would help with the impact analysis. The NYSDEC Bureau of Fisheries produces annual reports which may also have relevant information.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
2	Section 3.1.2, Fisheries of Special Concern – the document does not mention efforts by the FWS and our partners under the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture. This is a species of concern to us due to degradation and loss of habitat as well as declining populations (due to habitat impacts, climate change, and other factors). It is also a keystone species, representing other cold water biota. More information should be provided here on this species and the efforts to restore habitat. Just as important is an adequate analysis of the potential impacts from the proposed project on habitat (physical, chemical and abiotic attributes).	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
3	Section 3.1.2.3, New York Programs – This section should be updated to indicate that the New York Field Office provided information to consultants for the project on federally-listed species.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
4	Section 3.1.3, Construction and Operation Impacts – General information is provided in this section and no substantial commitments are made to avoid impacts and minimize unavoidable loss. For example, it says fish migration may be temporarily blocked due to construction. A preferred approach would be to indicate that no work would take place during times when fish are migrating through a particular water body. The text also minimizes tree removal along the banks of streams to be crossed as minor and temporary. However, bank erosion can have long-term effects on stream stability and stream habitat. It would be preferably for the pipeline to be sited only in areas where there are openings adjacent to the stream and then be required to plant trees in work areas when finished. Special consideration should be given to the Hudson River crossing and should be discussed in the document.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
5	Section 3.2.1, Existing Resources- Table 3.2-1 should be revised to indicate that the cerulean warbler is found in the New York section of the project and has been documented close to the project area. Page 3-35, the common name for Gyrinophilus porphyriticus should be northern spring salamander and not purple salamander.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
6	The text indicates that the project will bisect a portion of the Cannonsville-Steam Mill Important Bird Area. Mapping provided by Tennessee indicates that a significant portion of the IBA will be bisected where the project does not collocate with the Constitution Pipeline in this area. Although the Constitution project will bisect a portion of the IBA, it appears that efforts were made to avoid a significant portion and instead will traverse mostly the perimeter. The NED project however would bisect substantially more IBA and presumably interior forest. This is of a concern to our agency. We request FERC require more justification for the current NED design and why it cannot collocate with the Constitution project to avoid the IBA. Consultations between Audubon and NYSDEC about this issue should include the FWS as well.	Based on consultations with appropriate federal and state agencies and private organizations, Tennessee has incorporated route modifications through many of these sensitive wildlife habitat areas to minimize impacts on cover type conversion and limit potential habitat fragmentation impacts. The Project will be co-located within or alongside existing rights-of-way through crossings of most of the areas in eastern New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, further reducing and minimizing impacts. Consequently, it is likely that the past and present projects, in combination with the proposed Project, will have minor cumulative effects to special status species and their habitats.	RR3, Section 3.5.2.2.1	3-122 to 3-123

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
7	Impacts to interior forest are of concern to the FWS for many species but particularly migratory birds. Even those areas of the NED project which will be collocated with other rights-of-way will cause loss of habitat and push the impacts deeper into interior forests in most cases. We recommend FERC require an analysis of this impact on interior forest habitat. A discussion between Tennessee and the FWS should address how this analysis would take place.	Contiguous forested tracts greater than 100 acres in size crossed by the Project were evaluated, including both new pipeline corridor and co-located corridor. In areas where a new corridor is proposed, Tennessee has calculated interior forest loss resulting from direct impacts of the Project footprint and evaluated indirect impacts to remaining patches resulting from edge effect.	RR3, Section 3.2.2.6 RR3, Attachment 3b, Table 3.2-3 RR3, Section 3.2.2.9	3-53 to 3-54 3b-13 to 3b-27 3-59
8	A footnote appears to be missing on Table 3.2-2. It should be noted that there be other sensitive wildlife habitats not listed on this table such as interior forests.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
9	As currently written, the document provides very limited information on potential avoidance and minimization measures for impacts to wildlife and habitat. For example, there is no commitment to timing the project construction outside of the breeding season for migratory birds. Further, staging and other work areas should be sited in previously disturbed areas to the greatest extent practicable. Finally, there is no mention of mitigation for the loss of habitat. If construction timing cannot avoid the breeding season, pre-construction surveys for species of conservation concern may be requested near known locations in 2016.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
10	Section 3.4, Endangered and Threatened Species – The bog turtle and Northern long-eared bat should be noted for New York in Table 3.4-1. The status of the Northern long-eared bat on that table and Table 3.4-4 should be changed from Candidate to Threatened. Likewise, the text of the document should be updated to reflect the status change.	Addressed in the July 24, 2015 Filing.		
11	We have not yet received the survey results for the bald eagle surveys. Because this species has been expanding its range and breeding territories each year, the FWS may request a nest survey in the spring of 2016.	The bald eagle survey reports have been provided.	Vol III, App FF	N/A

**Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports,  
October 8, 2015**

This page intentionally left blank



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 1 - Project Description</b>				
1	<p>General – Include all information listed in Resource Report (RR) 1 (or in the Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports matrix) listed as pending, “will be addressed in the final ER,” or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal) in the July 24, 2015 Resource Reports, which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>a. updated aerial imagery for the Project area;</p> <p>b. status of wetland and waterbody field surveys and site-specific waterbody and wetland plans and associated crossing techniques;</p> <p>c. site-specific residential construction plans for all relevant areas;</p> <p>d. detailed construction schedule showing Project components by year (e.g., 2017, 2018);</p>	<p>a. Updated aerial imagery has been utilized for the aerial alignment sheets in Volume II.</p> <p>b. Tennessee is in the process of contacting affected landowners and obtaining survey permission for the properties proposed to be crossed by the Project. Tennessee identified, located, classified, and delineated wetland resources within and adjacent to the Project area through field surveys conducted in 2014 and 2015 on properties where access has been obtained. Completion of field surveys will be dependent upon the finalization of the Project alignment, as well as the acquisition of survey permission on all affected parcels. This process may extend after the issuance of the certificate order, should the Project be approved by the Commission. Field survey data shown on the aerial alignment sheets included in Volume II, Appendix F, incorporates survey data obtained through September 29, 2015, and field surveys are continuing as survey access is granted. Where survey was not available, Tennessee photo-interpreted wetland boundaries from high resolution aerial photography based on March 2015 flights. Publicly available data sources were utilized for areas where the Project route has deviated since the route was flown in March 2015 to obtain high resolution aerial imagery. Site-specific wetland and waterbody crossing plans are provided for field surveyed wetlands.</p> <p>c. Site-specific drawings have been developed for occupied residential buildings within 50 feet of the construction workspace that identify measures to minimize disruption and maintain access to the residences.</p> <p>d. The detailed construction schedule is attached to this Response to Comments matrix.</p>	<p>a. Vol II, App F</p> <p>b. RR1, Section 1.2.6 RR2, Section 2.3 RR1, Section 1.2.7 Volume II, Appendix Q</p> <p>c. Vol II, App P</p> <p>d. Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1a</p>	<p>a. N/A</p> <p>b. 1-78 to 1-79 2-69 to 2-88 1-79 to 1-94</p> <p>c. N/A</p> <p>d. N/A</p>
	<p>e. identification of additional delivery points and description of any associated metering and regulation facilities;</p> <p>f. updated discussions between Tennessee Gas and the other utility entities regarding co-location. State specifically whether these individual entities would allow Tennessee Gas to use portions of their existing rights-of-way for construction, operation, or both and define any potential physical constraints (e.g., guy wires). Where existing rights-of-way would not be shared, indicate whether the NED Project would directly abut the existing corridor. Include a fully descriptive table, with explanations and details included that lists each area where a generally co-located Project segment would temporarily deviate away from other co-located utilities due to the existence of obstacles. Based on the results of these discussions, both for other utilities unwilling to share their right-of-way as well as for physical obstacles, indicate whether (and where) the proposed Project centerline and associated workspaces would have to be modified;</p> <p>g. evaluations (including details of ongoing discussions with regulatory agencies) regarding the feasibility of additional horizontal directional drills (HDDs) in sites containing forested wetlands with an impact of more than 0.5-acre per crossing or in sites containing any high quality or specially designated forested wetland;</p>	<p>e. A description of all new delivery points is provided in Section 1.1.2.1, Pipeline Facilities. A description of all meter stations is provided in Section 1.1.2.2.</p> <p>f. Tennessee is engaged in discussions with the power companies regarding co-location and the proposed overlapping of Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project permanent easements and temporary construction workspaces with that of existing powerline easements and these discussions are ongoing. Tennessee is currently conducting surveys of the powerline easements and may adjust the proposed centerline location of the pipeline and overlapping areas for the Project to reflect the results of these surveys, including appropriate mitigation for safety and operational considerations, as well as landowner and agency concerns, avoidance of sensitive environmental resources, and construction considerations.</p> <p>g. Tennessee has investigated specific wetland crossings to determine the feasibility of using horizontal directional drill (“HDD”) based on the specific conditions at the crossing location. Tennessee has not committed to HDD across all forested wetlands with an impact of more than 0.5 acre or high quality or specially designated forested wetlands. However, Tennessee will continue to consult with regulatory agencies regarding wetland crossing procedures. Locations of all proposed HDDs are included in Table 1.3-2 in Resource Report 1. Tennessee will provide final HDD locations in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>e. RR1, Section 1.1.2.1 RR1, Section 1.1.2.2</p> <p>f. RR1, Section 1.0 To be updated in Supplemental Filing.</p> <p>g. RR2, Section 2.3.6.4 RR2, Section 2.2.11.4 RR1, Table 1.3-2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>e. 1-22 to 1-30 1-31 to 1-60</p> <p>f. 1-1 to 1-4</p> <p>g. 2-89 2-68 1-108 to 1-109</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>h. evaluations regarding the potential for using HDDs at all major waterbodies and sites where waterbody crossings would be greater than 30-feet-wide and a dry construction method is not feasible, as well as at all waterbodies listed as sensitive or high quality;</p> <p>i. evaluations regarding whether Tennessee Gas would install communication towers as part of the Project, and, if so, describe their location and features;</p> <p>j. updates regarding the identification and full description of any non-jurisdictional facilities associated with the Project including potential service for water, sewer, telephone, internet/data, or other utilities at aboveground facilities. If there are any non-jurisdictional facilities that would be built as a result of the new gas volumes associated with this Project, include the following detailed information for each facility:</p> <p>i. company/owner;</p> <p>ii. type of facility;</p> <p>iii. dimensions (pipe diameter, length, horsepower, etc. as appropriate for pipeline and land area for other facilities);</p> <p>iv. maps showing locations;</p> <p>v. federal permits required and their status;</p> <p>vi. status of local and state permits required; and</p> <p>vii. any environmental reviews required for local, state, or federal permitting authorities.</p>	<p>h. Tennessee has investigated specific waterbody crossings to determine the feasibility of using HDD based on the specific conditions at the crossing location. Tennessee is continuing to evaluate waterbody crossing methods based on field survey information. Locations of all proposed HDDs are included in Table 1.3-2 in Resource Report 1. Tennessee will provide final HDD locations in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>i. A free-standing communication tower, measuring less than 100 feet with no guy wires but with associated communication lines, will be installed at each new compressor station. No communication towers are anticipated to be installed at new meter stations or mainline valve ("MLV") sites as part of the Project, communication towers in-service at existing meter stations where modifications are proposed will be utilized.</p> <p>j. Potential non-jurisdictional facilities associated with Project compressor stations identified to date have been included. Tennessee will provide updates regarding non-jurisdictional facilities in a supplemental filing as more information becomes available.</p>	<p>h. RR2, Section 2.2.11.4</p> <p>RR1, Table 1.3-2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>i. RR1, Section 1.3.3.6</p> <p>j. RR1, Section 1.7 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>h. 2-68</p> <p>i. 1-108 to 1-109</p> <p>i. 1-116</p> <p>j. 1-137 to 1-142</p>
	<p>k. an updated table listing the deviations that Tennessee Gas is requesting from the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Procedures) including the section number of the Plan or Procedures for the requested deviation, a description of the deviation itself, justification for the deviation, and a description of how the deviation would provide equal or greater mitigation. Additionally, provide a summary table stating how each State Environmental Construction Plan (ECP) differs from one another and from the FERC Plan and Procedures; and</p> <p>l. summary of scour analysis, and a cross-reference to where the detailed scour analysis discussion is provided in appropriate RRs.</p>	<p>k. A table listing the deviations from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC's") Plan and Procedures is included as an attachment to this matrix.</p> <p>l. Tennessee will conduct a scour analysis as access along the pipeline route is granted. Results of the scour analysis will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>k. Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1b</p> <p>l. RR1, Section 1.3.1.4 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>k. N/A</p> <p>l. 1-97</p>
2	<p>Section 1.1.1 (page 1-10) – Include, to the extent known, the possible uses of the Project's end-users/customers for the gas capacity created. If possible, break down (by delivery point) the current known customer and/or use (e.g., electric generation, residential use/consumption, local distribution, industrial/manufacturing, manufacturing precursors).</p>	<p>End users/customers for the Project are included in Exhibit I of the Certificate application.</p>	<p>Certificate Application, Exhibit I</p>	<p>N/A</p>
3	<p>For each delivery lateral, identify the volumes of gas that would be delivered and identify the delivery points/customers.</p>	<p>Information regarding volumes of gas to be delivered for each delivery lateral is attached to this response matrix.</p>	<p>Response to Comments Matrix, Attachment 1c</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
4	Section 1.1.1 (page 1-10) – Include a list that identifies local distribution companies (LDCs) and their service areas that have expressed direct interest in receiving natural gas from the Project. In addition, list any other LDCs that are viable candidates to potentially receive natural gas from the Project.	Tennessee engaged in discussions with multiple local distribution companies ("LDCs") (14 total in New York and New England) along its existing system that expressed direct interest in the Project as well as LDCs in Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine. Due to confidentiality agreements, Tennessee cannot disclose the names of those LDCs. LDCs that are viable candidates to receive natural gas from the Project include LDCs with service territories located along Tennessee's existing system in New York and New England as well as LDCs whose service territories are located along other regional pipelines, including Dominion Transmission, Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P., Algonquin Gas Transmission, Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System, and Granite State Transmission by Tennessee's interconnections with those pipelines. In addition, the new mainline pipeline in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire will allow for the opportunity for new distribution systems to be developed where natural gas service is not available today.	N/A	N/A
5	Section 1.1.2.2.1 (page 1-30) – Identify the overall parcel size for each proposed compressor station.	The overall parcel size for each proposed compressor station is provided in the compressor station site plans. Additional descriptions of the proposed compressor stations is included in Resource Report 8, including site-specific discussions of additional properties proposed for acquisition to provide for additional mitigation for noise sensitive receptors and/or other environmental resources.	RR1, Section 1.1.2.2.1 Volume II, Appendix R RR8, Section 8.4.2.1	1-31 to 1-47 8-142 to 8-146
6	Provide public versions of the compressor station site plans that identify workspaces, fencelines, cleared areas and general location of compressor station components.	Public versions of the compressor station site plans have been provided.	Volume II, Appendix R	N/A
7	Section 1.2.4 (page 1-62) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 Environmental Information Request (EIR), indicate whether forests, wetlands, waterbodies, or other sensitive resources would be affected by use of the contractor yards. Update RRs 2 and 3 appropriately.	Contractor yards that are proposed to be used for the Project include those located in previously disturbed areas such as open fields, sand and gravel pits, parking lots and industrial facilities. Although certain wetland impacts for these previously disturbed areas are included in Resource Report 2, Tennessee will select contractor yard sites considering these environmental impacts identified during environmental field surveys and obtain the appropriate regulatory permits prior to utilizing these sites.	RR1, Section 1.2.4 RR2, Section 2.3.5.4 RR3, Section 3.2.2.7 RR3, Section 3.3.3 RR3, Section 3.4.2	1-77 2-88 3-58 3-86 3-105 to 3-106

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
8	Section 1.3.1.1 (page 1-83) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, describe any special measures that would be employed to prevent post-restoration slips and landslides in steep terrain. In addition, describe the process for how rocks that might roll off the construction right-of-way beyond the reach of equipment positioned on the right-of-way would be retrieved.	In areas along the right-of-way ("ROW") where steep side slopes are encountered, the two-tone cut and fill construction methods will be utilized for equipment and/or personnel safety considerations. Additional temporary workspace ("ATWS") will be needed at these locations to accommodate excavated material from the temporary cut and fill areas, while allowing for the temporary storage of trench spoil, excess rock material, cut timber, and, in some cases, salvageable topsoil. When side slopes that require special construction are encountered, the two-tone construction technique will be employed, which entails benching into the side-slope to provide a level work surface. During grade restoration of side slope locations, the spoil will be placed back in the cut and compacted. Any springs or seeps found in the cut will be carried down-slope through poly vinyl chloride ("PVC") pipe and/or gravel French drains installed as part of the cut restoration. Tennessee will install slope breakers, erosion matting, geotextile fabric, gabion baskets, rip-rap, etc., dependent on site-specific conditions, local requirements, and landowner requests, to prevent post-restoration slips and landslides in steep terrain. Additionally, Tennessee will attempt to retain all soil and/or rock on the construction ROW in rugged topography using fencing, hay bales or other containment materials, such as timber mats. In the event that soil and/or rock does exit the ROW, Tennessee will retrieve the material as soon as practical either by hand or using equipment to reach out and retrieve the material. No ground disturbance will be allowed outside the certificated ROW without the necessary agency approvals. If the material has, or has the potential to, impact sensitive features, Tennessee will contact the applicable agency to determine the most appropriate course of action.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.1	1-102 to 1-103
9	Section 1.3.1.13 (page 1-81) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, describe the source or type of source of imported soils during restoration and plans to address associated issues such as the spread of invasive plant species, soil type compatibility, and rock content.	Tennessee will restore the construction workspace in accordance with Project-specific Environmental Construction Plans ("ECPs") for each state (including the Invasive Species Management Plan), applicable seed mix requirements from the Natural Resources Conservation Service ("NRCS") or applicable county agencies, and relevant landowner agreements. If additional soil is needed during restoration, displaced material from other Project locations may be imported or local area supplies may be used as necessary.	RR1, Section 1.3.1.13 Vol II, App J9, K9, L9, M9, and N9	1-100 to 1-101
10	Section 1.3.2.2 (page 1-84) – Confirm that pre- and post-construction testing of groundwater would include any spring (not just wells) if requested by the landowner. List the specific water quality parameters or suites of parameters that would be analyzed for wells and springs.	Tennessee is planning to test water wells within 200 feet of the construction workspace along the ROW, both before and after construction, for water quantity and quality parameters. In order for a landowner or resident to immediately qualify for post-construction testing, they must allow Tennessee access to property on which such water wells are located to conduct a pre-construction test. Tennessee will conduct testing of all wells within the proposed constraints area as referenced above, both pre- and post-construction, unless otherwise prohibited by the resident or landowner. Tennessee will similarly, at the request of a landowner, sample developed springs used for drinking water pre- and post-construction within the area referenced above. Water quality parameters for testing of both wells and springs will include: yield, pH, petroleum based hydrocarbons, total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, nitrates, nitrites, arsenic, iron, manganese, lead, copper, and total coliform bacteria. oil/grease, pH, flow, turbidity, and total suspended solids. For wells identified close to a septic system, testing will also include fecal coliform.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.2	1-104

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
11	Section 1.3.2.2 (page 1-85) – Clarify how Tennessee Gas would assess and repair damage to private or public roads caused by the Project-related traffic from heavy trucks and equipment, not just from the actual road crossings themselves. Confirm that Tennessee Gas would ultimately be responsible for any Project-related damage to roads, not its contractor.	Tennessee will conduct a pre-construction road assessment of pre-existing conditions, which may include video documentation and photographs. Tennessee will also conduct a post-construction evaluation to identify any damage caused by the Project. Tennessee will be responsible for repairs of any damage as determined through discussions with local agencies.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.2	1-103 to 1-104
12	Section 1.3.2.5.2 (page 1-86) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, discuss whether Tennessee Gas, in certain circumstances, may be able to pull back an HDD section in sub-sections, thereby increasing flexibility, minimizing the false right-of-way, and precluding the requirement of pulling one continuous section. If feasible, identify the specific crossings where this method would be employed.	At this time, Tennessee is still evaluating each proposed HDD crossing. Geotechnical investigation for each HDD must be completed; however, for some locations, lack of landowner access has hindered the geotechnical investigations. Therefore, the final crossing designs for each HDD have not been finalized to determine the need for false ROWs for pullback sections. Tennessee will provide final HDD plans in a supplemental filing.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.5.2 To be updated in Supplemental Filing	1-106 to 1-107
13	Section 1.3.2.6 (page 1-89) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, include a discussion regarding whether blasting would be used in areas of limestone or karst geology. Note that karst geology is not discussed in the blasting management plan and that blasting is not discussed in the karst mitigation plan.	Blasting may be required in areas of limestone and/or karst geology. If voids or sinkholes are discovered during blasting or excavation, measures in the Karst Mitigation Plan will be followed. Tennessee has identified areas where publicly available data indicate areas of shallow depth to bedrock overlap with karst terrain.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.6 Volume II, Appendices K and L, Attachment 13 RR6 Table 6.4.4	1-110 to 1-111 6-75 to 6-77
14	Discuss the feasibility of alternate methods of rock excavation/removal other than blasting by rock type.	The determination of construction method in rocky areas is based on site-specific conditions and cannot be determined until construction. Blasting will generally be limited to areas of consolidated rock.	RR1, Section 1.3.2.6	1-110 to 1-111
15	Section 1.4.3 (page 1-97) – For each cathodic protection facility, provide any identification number, associated access road (if applicable) including directional orientation to the road, approximate length and width of the facility, area affected, and associated land use type.	Requested information regarding cathodic protection facilities will be provided in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
16	Section 1.5 (page 1-122) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, provide a description of work/upgrades that would take place at Station 319 due to the planned/proposed Susquehanna West Project.	There is currently a description of work proposed for Susquehanna West in Resource Report 1. There have been no changes since the July filing.	RR1, Section 1.5	1-128 to 1-130
17	It has come to our attention that areas where the pipeline would abut powerline right-of-ways may not be fully cleared of trees. Indicate if existing trees within the powerline right-of-ways would need to be cleared and indicate this additional clearing in the resource report impact tables as a separate line-item.	The land use impact table in Resource Report 8 identifies the acreage of forested areas that will be cleared. Tennessee is engaged in discussions with the power companies regarding co-location and the proposed overlapping of NED Project permanent easements and temporary construction workspaces with that of existing powerline easements and these discussions are ongoing. Tennessee is currently conducting surveys of the powerline easements and may adjust the proposed centerline location of the pipeline and overlapping areas for the Project to reflect the results of these surveys, including appropriate mitigation for safety and operational considerations, as well as landowner and agency concerns, avoidance of sensitive environmental resources, and construction considerations. Site-specific information regarding tree clearing will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR8, Table 8.1-2 RR1, Section 1.0 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	8-6 to 8-9 1-1 to 1-4

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
18	Provide updated micro-routing along the planned powerlines for areas where the pipeline would need to move away from the existing right of way due to constructability or other issues.	Tennessee has completed some micro-routing based on landowner requests and agency requests, as reported in Resource Report 10. Tennessee is engaged in discussions with the power companies regarding co-location and the proposed overlapping of NED Project permanent easements and temporary construction workspaces with that of existing powerline easements and these discussions are ongoing. Tennessee is currently conducting surveys of the powerline easements and may adjust the proposed centerline location of the pipeline and overlapping areas for the Project to reflect the results of these surveys, including appropriate mitigation for safety and operational considerations, as well as landowner and agency concerns, avoidance of sensitive environmental resources, and construction considerations. Site-specific information regarding deviations from the powerline easement will be provided in a supplemental filing. Any updates to the route will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR10, Table 10.3-16 RR10, Table 10.3-17 RR1, Section 1.0 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	10-87 to 10-92 10-93 to 10-98 1-1 to 1-4
19	Consult with land managing agencies, state and local planning agencies, and other appropriate entities to identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future in the potential resource Region of Influence that could be affected by the NED Project, as indicated in the table below. The projects should include, but not be limited to: industrial or commercial facilities; mines; FERC jurisdictional projects; intrastate pipelines and compression; gathering pipelines; gas processing facilities; gas wells, industrial; infrastructure development (roads, bridges, rail, etc.), housing developments, etc. Include a table that identifies: • the project(s) type/name and county; • approximate distance and direction of the project(s) from the proposed NED Project facilities; • a description of the project(s); and • the current status and schedule of the project(s) (e.g., proposed for December 2016, under construction, completed).	Local planning agencies were consulted for projects located within 1/4 mile of the pipeline and facilities. Other projects, including those types listed in the comment, were identified through publicly available documents on agency websites, including FERC, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, State Departments of Environmental Protection, State Departments of Transportation ("DOTs"), State Siting Boards/Councils, etc. All projects are listed in Table 1.9-2 in Resource Report 1. Cumulative Impacts have been analyzed using the requested or more conservative parameters appropriate for the project as identified in Table 1.9-1 in Resource Report 1.	RR1, Section 1.9 RR1, Attachment 1b, Table 1.9-2 RR1, Table 1.9-1	1-154 to 1-162 1b-47 to 1b-54 1-156 to 1-161
<b>Resource Report 2 - Water Use and Quality</b>				
20	General – Include all information listed in RR2 as pending or "TBD" (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: k. discussion regarding groundwater classification in the New Hampshire portion of the Project, post-consultation with New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services; l. locations of new compressor stations and associated potential impacts to groundwater; m. location of public and private drinking water wells and springs located within 150 feet of any Project workspace area; n. avoidance and mitigation measures that would be taken around wellhead protection areas (WHPAs); o. exact locations of pipe yards and contractor yards, as well as their potential resource impacts including wetlands and waterbodies;	k. Groundwater classification in the New Hampshire portion of the Project have been included in Resource Report 2. l. Consultations to identify potential impacts to groundwater from compressor station locations are in progress. Information received to date is provided in Resource Report 2. Additional information will be provided in a supplemental filing. m. Table 2.1-2 identifies all known public and private water supply wells, springs, and locally zoned aquifer protection and/or wellhead protection areas ("WHPAs") located within 200 feet of construction work areas associated with the Project. n. Tennessee has identified all WHPAs within the Project area. Tennessee is continuing consultation with local governments to determine avoidance and minimization measures around WHPAs. Results of the consultations will be provided in a supplemental filing. o. Tennessee has identified 198 contractor yards for the proposed Project. The contractor yards are typically sited in existing fields, existing paved lots, or other previously disturbed areas and will not require any modifications to the existing land use. Tennessee has sited these facilities outside of wetlands to the extent practicable. Locations of proposed contractor yards are depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey ("USGS") 7.5 minute topographic maps and aerial alignment sheets.	k. RR2, Section 2.1.1.4.3 l. RR2, Section 2.1.2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing m. RR2, Attachment 2b, Table 2.1-2 n. RR2, Section 2.1.6 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing o. RR2, Section 2.2.4 RR2, Section 2.3.4 RR8, Section 8.1.4 Volume II, Appendices E and F	k. 2-12 l. 2-16 m. 2b-1 to 2b-17 n. 2-25 to 2-27 o. 2-39 2-87 to 2-88 8-19

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>p. impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for waterbodies containing fisheries resources and how timing restrictions on those waterbodies may influence the Project schedule;</p> <p>q. locations of all potable water intakes within 3 miles downstream of any proposed waterbody crossing;</p> <p>r. sensitive public water supply watersheds;</p> <p>s. hydrostatic test water quantity needed, as well as discharge location;</p> <p>t. field survey results and wetland delineation reports;</p> <p>u. identification of wetland impacts associated with each facility;</p> <p>v. wetland mitigation provisions;</p> <p>w. State Wetland Classifications; and</p> <p>x. wetland-specific crossing methods.</p>	<p>p. Waterbodies crossed by the Project or within the construction workspace will be protected by adherence to Tennessee's Project-specific Plan and Procedures and Tennessee's Project-specific ECPs for each state. In addition, Tennessee will include any additional permit conditions required by federal, state, and local agencies. Tennessee continues to evaluate waterbody crossing procedures including dry crossing, conventional bore, and HDD. Timing for crossing state-designated coldwater or significant coolwater or warm water fisheries will be based on agency consultations. In the absence of State timing guidance, the Commission's Procedures will be used.</p> <p>q. A table of potable water intakes has been provided.</p> <p>r. Sensitive public water supply watersheds have been discussed for each state crossed by the Project. Sensitive public water supply watersheds have been identified in Massachusetts and Connecticut.</p> <p>s. Hydrostatic test water fill locations and quantity of water needed have been provided. Discharge locations will be dependent on local permit requirements and will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>t. Wetland Delineation reports have been provided as attachments to Resource Report 2.</p> <p>u. Construction and operation impacts are discussed for each facility.</p> <p>v. Tennessee will consult with the applicable federal and state regulatory agencies for guidance during development of mitigation measures for wetland impacts. Tennessee will provide mitigation provisions based on permit requirements as they are developed in a supplemental filing(s).</p> <p>w. State wetland classifications are provided in tables as an attachment to Resource Report 2.</p>	<p>p. RR2, Section 2.2.11                      RR3, Section 3.1.4</p> <p>q. RR2, Table 2.1-4</p> <p>r. RR2, Section 2.2.6.1.3                      RR2, Section 2.2.6.1.5</p> <p>s. RR2, Table 2.2-9                      To be updated in Supplemental Filing</p> <p>t. RR2, Attachments 2c - 2g</p> <p>u. RR2, Section 2.3.5</p> <p>v. RR2, Section 2.3.8                      To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>w. RR2, Attachment 2b,                      Tables 2.3-1, 2.3-3, 2.3-5, 2.3-7,                      and 2.3-9</p>	<p>p. 2-63                      3-18 to 3-20</p> <p>q. 2-18</p> <p>r. 2-44 to 2-45                      2-46 to 2-47</p> <p>s. 2-47 to 2-50</p> <p>t. Attachments 2c-2g</p> <p>u. 2-88 to 2-89</p> <p>v. 2-94</p> <p>w. 2b-59 to 2b-68                      2b-71 to 2b-88                      2b-91 to 2b-108                      2b-111 to 2b-133                      2b-137 to 2b-140</p>
21	<p>General – Include justification for all modifications to the Commission's Procedures including but not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>y. section 2.3.5.1 (page 2-96) site-specific locations of additional temporary workspace (ATWS) within 50 feet of wetlands; and</p> <p>z. table 2.3-12 (page 2-161) – any site-specific locations where a construction workspace greater than 75 feet would be utilized in wetlands.</p>	<p>x. Crossing methods are provided in tables as an attachment to Resource Report 2. Crossing methods are described in Section 2.3.6.</p> <p>y. Tennessee has provided site-specific locations and justifications of ATWS within 50 feet of wetlands in Resource Report 8.</p> <p>z. Table 2.3-12 provides a list by mileposts of any areas where greater than 75 feet of construction workspace will be utilized in wetlands and provides site-specific justification for these proposed modifications from the Procedures.</p>	<p>x. RR2, Attachment 2b,                      Tables 2.3-1, 2.3-3, 2.3-5, 2.3-7,                      and 2.3-9</p> <p>RR2, Section 2.3.6</p> <p>y. RR8, Section 8.1.1.3                      RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.1-4</p> <p>z. RR2, Table 2.3-12</p>	<p>x. 2b-59 to 2b-68                      2b-71 to 2b-88                      2b-91 to 2b-108                      2b-111 to 2b-133                      2b-137 to 2b-140</p> <p>2-89 to 2-90</p> <p>y. 8-10                      8b-1 to 8b-105</p> <p>z. 2-92 to 2-93</p>
22	<p>Section 2.1 (page 2-2) – In the groundwater descriptions, include a detailed description of the aquifers in each state including the names, beginning and ending mileposts (MPs) for each crossing, confining layers, principal use, depth to water, and general water quality. Update table 2.1-2 to include aquifer name, well depth, and yield. Include a discussion on stratified drift and granite aquifers and potential impacts and mitigation.</p>	<p>Detailed descriptions of aquifers crossed in each state have been provided. A new table including aquifer name, beginning and ending mileposts for each crossing, well depth, and yield will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>RR2, Section 2.1                      To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>2-2 to 2-15</p>
23	<p>Section 2.1.1.1.1 (page 2-2) – Discuss construction/operations precautions that would be implemented near WHPAs as well as any mitigation measures that may be required by WHPA managers. Provide updated correspondence with the Town of Wilmington regarding the Zone 1 WHPA that would be crossed by the pipeline.</p>	<p>Tennessee proposes to implement Best Management Practices ("BMPs") designed to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate potential impacts on groundwater during construction and operation as detailed within the Project-specific ECPs for each state (Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N) and Tennessee's Project-specific Plan and Procedures (Volume II, Appendix H). Tennessee will continue consultation with local governments to determine avoidance and minimization measures for areas where the pipeline crosses WHPAs. No new correspondence has been received from the Town of Wilmington.</p>	<p>RR2, Section 2.1.6                      Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N                      Volume II, Appendix H</p>	<p>2-25 to 2-27</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
24	Section 2.1.1.2.1 (page 2-3) –This section states that “New York also has a Wellhead Protection Program Plan (“WHPP”), which is consistent with New York policy on WHPAs, but is not a regulation.” Clarify whether Project construction and operation would be conducted in accordance with the WHPP.	Tennessee will work with New York Department of Health to identify regulatory agency requirements relevant to all programs and the Project.	RR2, Section 2.1.1.2.1	2-4
25	Section 2.1.1.2.3 (page 2-7) – Define the groundwater designation ‘Class GA.’ Clarify whether this classification includes all groundwater or just potable groundwater.	Class GA is a source of potable water supply.	RR2, Section 2.1.1.2.3	2-8
26	Section 2.1.5 (page 2-16) – Define “water supply protection area” in table 2.1-2. Does this include both groundwater and surface water drinking supply areas? Be sure to specify whether the water supply protection area is for a groundwater source or surface water source.	Table 2.1-2 includes both groundwater and surface water drinking supply areas that are publicly available; however, the data provided does not indicate whether the source is groundwater or surface water. Tennessee will continue consultation with the agencies in order to update the table with the information requested.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Table 2.1-2	2b-1 to 2b-17
27	Section 2.1.6 (page 2-27) – Include a discussion of potential aquifer impacts resulting from ground disturbing activities (e.g., HDD drilling, blasting). Include mitigation measures for potentially affected springs and aquifers. Identify alternative water sources if water supplies are impacted.	The NED Project is not anticipated to have impacts on groundwater quality or supply. Tennessee proposes to implement BMPs designed to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate potential impacts on groundwater during construction and operation as detailed within the Project-specific ECPs for each state and Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures. Every explosive blast will be monitored and documented. The blasting work will be completed by a state licensed contractor. Tennessee and its contractors will adhere to practices related to groundwater protection, including specifications for trench breakers and dewatering, as well as restrictions on refueling and storage of hazardous substances. In the unlikely event that construction of the proposed Project is determined to have temporarily impacted private or public well quality or yield, Tennessee will provide alternative water sources or other compensation to the well owner. Should permanent well damage be sustained, Tennessee will either compensate the well owner or make arrangements for a new well to be drilled.	RR2, Section 2.1.6 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N Volume II, Appendix H	2-25 to 2-26
28	Section 2.1.6 (page 2-27) – Include a discussion on trench dewatering; include specific locations where dewatering would be required or anticipated to be required.	Trench dewatering is likely to occur in areas where there is shallow groundwater or after heavy rains. Tennessee proposes to implement BMPs designed to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate potential impacts on groundwater during construction and operation as detailed within the Project-specific ECPs for each state and Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures.	RR2, Section 2.1.6 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N Volume II, Appendix H	2-25 to 2-27
29	Section 2.2 (page 2-28) – Identify all surface waterbodies crossed within karst-prone areas and their crossing methods.	Surfaces waters crossed, crossing methods, and identification of karst-prone areas are provided in tables as an attachment to Resource Report 2.	2b-27 to 2b-58	2b-27 to 2b-58
30	Section 2.2 (page 2-28) – Update tables 2.2-4, 2.2-5, 2.2-6, 2.2-7, and 2.2-8 showing waterbodies that would be crossed by the Project to include new information on correct crossing width, crossing method, and timing restrictions. Clarify whether crossing length and bank width are the same.	Tables have been updated to include requested information.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.2-4 to 2.2-8	2b-27 to 2b-58
31	Section 2.2 (page 2-28) – Update tables 2.2-5, 2.2-7, and 2.2-8 to provide fishery type designations and timing restriction data for all waterbodies that would be crossed by the Project in New York, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Include relevant citations along with an estimated timeline for the provision of this information, if it is not currently available.	Tables have been updated to include requested information.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.2-4 to 2.2-8	2b-27 to 2b-58



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
32	<p>Section 2.2 (page 2-28) – For each waterbody greater than 100 feet wide, the default construction method should be a HDD, direct pipe, or similar techniques. If one of these techniques is not feasible:</p> <p>aa. describe why an HDD or similar method is not possible;</p> <p>bb. provide a site-specific crossing plan; and</p> <p>cc. provide a mitigation and restoration plan.</p> <p>For crossings of major waterbodies that would be completed using in-stream and open water construction (e.g., clamshell dredging), provide the results of sediment modeling indicating the predicted fate and transport of excavated or dredged sediments. Describe the models that were used; the assumed ambient average and range of total suspended sediments in the waterbody; the anticipated direction, duration, and concentration of sediment plumes during construction; and the anticipated extent and depths of redeposited sediments on the riverbed or seabed.</p>	<p>Site-specific crossing plans have been provided for all waterbody crossings greater than 100 feet wide. To minimize temporary impacts on installation of the pipeline facilities, Tennessee will implement the waterbody construction procedures, erosion control measures, and post construction restoration activities identified in the Procedures and incorporated into the Project-specific ECPs for each state. Tennessee’s preferred methodology for restoration is the use of natural stream restoration techniques where flow velocities allow. In the case of proposed use of boulder, rip-rap, gabion, or other hard non-native stream bank erosion control restoration structures will require review and permit approval by the USACE, PADEP, NYSDEC, MADEP, NHDES, and/or CTDEEP prior to implementation. Descriptions of stream restoration techniques, including natural restoration techniques, are included in Tennessee’s Project-specific ECPs for each state.</p>	<p>Volume II, Appendix Q RR2, Section 2.2.11 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N Volume II, Appendix H</p>	2-63 to 2-65
33	<p>Section 2.2.1 (page 2-28) – Provide mitigation measures for all public water supply watersheds and reservoirs including but not limited to the Pennichuck Brook Watershed, the Cobleskill Reservoir System, and the Metropolitan District Commission’s public drinking water supply watersheds.</p>	<p>The NED Project is not anticipated to have impacts on public water supply watersheds and reservoirs. Tennessee will utilize BMPs outlined in Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and state-specific ECPs including the Spill Prevention and Response Plan to avoid and minimize adverse effects to drinking water sources. Additionally, to ensure compliance with Tennessee’s BMPs proposed for the Project, Environmental Inspectors (“EI”) will be employed during construction to oversee Tennessee’s BMPs are implemented and that the Project complies with applicable regulatory permits and approval conditions. Tennessee anticipates that implementation of these BMPs will allow for construction and operation of the Project without adversely affecting any public watershed or potable surface water supply areas.</p>	<p>RR2, Section 2.2.6.1.4 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 3 Volume II, Appendix H</p>	2-45
34	<p>Section 2.2.5 (page 2-41) – Identify all areas with known or potentially contaminated sediments.</p>	<p>Tennessee contacted state environmental agencies in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut and has searched federal and state databases to determine potential waterbodies with known contaminated sediments crossed by the Project. Contaminated sediments within the Project area are identified by Project component in Section 2.2.5.</p>	<p>RR2, Section 2.2.5 RR2, Attachment 2a, Figure 2.1-3</p>	2-40 to 2-42 Attachment 2a
35	<p>Section 2.2.6 (page 2-43) – Provide a table of all public drinking water supply watersheds, surface water reservoirs, and WHPAs. In the table, include crossing length or distance of each protected surface water supply from the project. Indicate if a waterbody crossing would be within 3 miles upstream of any potable water supply intakes. Specify details regarding the public usage of each of the protected surface waters identified. Identify appropriate mitigation measures within surface water protection areas (SWPA). Identify the government entities that manage the SWPAs within the Project area. Discuss local management/protection strategies and restrictions for SWPAs.</p>	<p>Tennessee will utilize BMPs outlined in Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and Project-specific ECPs for each state, including the Spill Prevention and Response Plan to avoid and minimize adverse effects to drinking water sources. Additionally, to ensure compliance with Tennessee’s BMPs proposed for the Project, EIs will be employed during construction to oversee Tennessee’s BMPs are implemented and that the Project complies with applicable regulatory permits and approval conditions. Tennessee anticipates that implementation of these BMPs will allow for construction and operation of the Project without adversely affecting any public watershed or potable surface water supply areas.</p> <p>Additional information requested regarding public usage of each of the protected surface waters identified and the government entities that manage surface water protection areas within the Project area will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>RR2, Section 2.2.6 RR2, Attachment 2b, Table 2.2-1 RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.1-2 and 2.1-3 RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.2-4 through 2.2-8 RR2, Table 2.1-4 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p>	2-42 to 2-46 2b-21 to 2b-26 2b-1 to 2b-20 2b-27 to 2b-58 2-18

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
36	Section 2.2.6 (page 2-43) – Include mitigation measures for all water supply areas within 150 feet of the Project area. Confirm whether Tennessee Gas would file a post-construction report describing any complaints received regarding water supply (aquifer, wells, and springs) quality and yield and how those complaints were resolved.	Tennessee will utilize BMPs outlined in Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and Project-specific ECPs for each state, including the Spill Prevention and Response Plan to avoid and minimize adverse effects to drinking water sources. Tennessee and its contractors will adhere to practices related to groundwater protection, including specifications for trench breakers and dewatering, as well as restrictions on refueling and storage of hazardous substances. In the unlikely event that construction of the proposed Project is determined to have temporarily impacted private or public well quality or yield, Tennessee will provide alternative water sources or other compensation to the well owner. Should permanent well damage be sustained, Tennessee will either compensate the well owner or make arrangements for a new well to be drilled. Additionally, to ensure compliance with Tennessee’s BMPs proposed for the Project, EI will be employed during construction to oversee Tennessee’s BMPs are implemented and that the Project complies with applicable regulatory permits and approval conditions. Tennessee anticipates that implementation of these BMPs will allow for construction and operation of the Project without adversely affecting any public watershed or potable surface water supply areas. Tennessee will file a post-construction report describing any complaints received regarding water supply quality and yield and how those complaints were resolved.	RR2, Section 2.1.6 RR2, Section 2.2.11 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N Volume II, Appendix H	2-25 to 2-27 2-62 to 2-65
37	Section 2.2.7 (page 2-48) – Include data for hydrostatic test pressure, volume (in gallons) of hydrostatic test water by specific source location (waterbody and MP), the expected month water would be withdrawn and discharged, and source alternatives. Include proposed treatment and/or disposal method for treated discharge water. Include specific locations of the test water discharges. Include a Hydrostatic Test Plan.	Hydrostatic test water fill locations and quantity of water needed have been provided. Discharge locations for hydrostatic test water will be subject to local permits. A Hydrostatic Test Plan will be prepared and provided with the Implementation Plan prior to construction. The Hydrostatic Test Plan will provide detailed information on hydrostatic test water fill and discharge locations, as well as month of withdraw and discharge.	RR2, Section 2.2.7 RR2, Table 2.2-9	2-47 2-47 to 2-50
38	Section 2.2.9 (page 2-52) – Provide updated information and consultations with state agencies on sensitive waterbodies and identify mitigation measures for potential impacts to sensitive waterbodies and fisheries.	Resource Report 2 has been updated with additional information obtained through agency consultation. All correspondence has been provided in Volume II. Temporary and permanent impacts associated with construction will be minimized to the extent practicable. Tennessee and its contractors will comply with mitigation measures detailed in the Project-specific Plan and Procedures and required as part of the permits and orders or conditions required for the Project, which will be incorporated into the Project-specific ECPs. Tennessee will continue to consult with the applicable agencies relative to measures recommended to protect fisheries resources and water quality within streams crossed by the proposed Project.	RR2, Section 2.2.9 Volume II, Appendix B Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N Volume II, Appendix H	2-51 to 2-61
39	Section 2.3 (pages 2-67 through 2-100) – Update section to include results from wetland field surveys. Provide the Wetland Delineation Reports.	Wetland Delineation reports have been provided as attachments to Resource Report 2.	RR2, Section 2.3 RR2, Attachments 2c through 2g	2-70 to 2-89 Attachments 2c-2g
40	Section 2.3 (pages 2-67 through 2-100) – Provide information regarding potential impacts on wetlands from the construction and operation of aboveground facilities, access roads, and contractor yards.	Tennessee has sited new compressor stations, meter stations, and MLVs outside of sensitive resources to the extent practicable. Impacts to wetlands from aboveground facilities, access roads, and contractor yards have been discussed.	RR2, Sections 2.3.2 through 2.3.4	2-87 to 2-88

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
41	Section 2.3 (pages 2-67 through 2-100) – Clarify how construction wetland acreages were calculated for all construction-related tables. In each wetland table, include specific construction right-of-way widths for each wetland crossed and note any wetlands with irregular workspaces, which could expand impacts beyond merely calculating length multiplied by width.	Construction acreage (footnote 8 on wetland tables) was calculated based on a 75-foot-wide construction ROW through the wetland. Any construction ROW greater than 75-feet is detailed in Table 2.3-12. Operational acreage (footnote 9 on wetland tables) was calculated based on a 10-foot-wide corridor permanently maintained in herbaceous vegetative cover through palustrine scrub-shrub wetlands, and 30-foot-wide corridor permanently maintained through palustrine forested wetlands where trees taller than 15 feet that could damage the pipeline coating will be selectively cut and removed. Acreages have been calculated in Geographic Information Systems ("GIS") and are not based on a length x width calculation.	RR2, Attachment 2b, Tables 2.3-1 through 2.3-11	2b-59 to 2b-143
<b>Resource Report 3 - Fisheries, Wildlife, and Vegetation</b>				
42	42. General – Include all information listed in RR3 as “pending” or “TBD,” or specify when it will be filed. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to: dd. all updated consultation information and documentation for information received after May 2015; ee. a discussion of potential Project-related impacts on interior forest and edge forest habitats that includes acreage by forest habitat type, and figures of the interior forest blocks that would be crossed by the Project; ff. results of field surveys conducted to characterize the natural landscape at the proposed Appalachian Trail crossing, as well as a crossing plan for the same location; gg. a list of common or representative plant species found in the Project area; hh. a list of vegetative community types in the Project area based on National Land Cover Database mapping;	dd. Correspondence received through October 1, 2015 has been included in Volumes II and III. ee. Contiguous forested tracts greater than 100 acres in size crossed by the Project were evaluated, including both new pipeline corridor and co-located corridor. In areas where a new corridor is proposed, Tennessee has calculated interior forest loss resulting from direct impacts of the Project footprint and evaluated indirect impacts to remaining patches resulting from edge effect. ff. Tennessee has developed a Trail Crossing Plan that establishes protocols to protect recreational users of the Appalachian Trail during construction, avoid and minimize impacts to the Trail and local environment, preserve the integrity of the Trail and user experience, and facilitate coordination with stakeholders through design and implementation. As of the date of this filing, Tennessee has not obtained approval from the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (“MADCR”) to conduct biological field surveys. Tennessee will fully characterize the natural landscape in the area where the Project will cross the Appalachian Trail once survey access has been granted and the Trail Crossing Plan will be updated accordingly. Tennessee will also continue to coordinate with the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game regarding the proposed crossing of the adjacent properties to assess impacts and avoid, and minimize impacts to the extent practicable. gg. Common plant species are provided in the text of Section 3.3.1 for each state and various cover types.	dd. Volume II, Appendix B Volume III, Appendix BB ee. RR3, Section 3.2.2.6 RR3, Attachment 3b, Table 3.2-3 RR3, Attachment 3a, Figure 3.2-2 ff. RR3, Section 3.2.2.3.3 Volume II, Appendix L, Attachment L14 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing gg. RR3, Section 3.3.1	dd. N/A ee. 3-53 to 3-56 3b-13 to 3b-27 Attachment 3a ff. 3-39 to 3-40 gg. 3-59 to 3-73
	ii. the results of vernal pool surveys conducted for the Project area with a detailed impact assessment on vernal pools potentially affected by the Project. Include the locations and timing of any ongoing and/or future vernal pool surveys; jj. a discussion of potential construction and operation impacts on vegetation outside the pipeline construction right-of-way associated with any aboveground facilities and appurtenant facilities (mainline valves [MLVs], pig launchers, and receivers), temporary and permanent access roads, pipe and contractor yards, cathodic protection systems, and alternating current mitigation systems; kk. the results of surveys for protected species and their habitat, including vegetative communities of special concern within the Project area, along with any updates to the locations, timing, and reporting schedule of ongoing or future surveys;	hh. Common community types are provided in the text of Section 3.3.1 for each state. Natural communities are also provided in Tables 3.3-1 and 3.3-2. ii. During the spring of 2015, all potential vernal pools were surveyed for evidence of breeding by obligate vernal pool species on parcels where access was available. The process of identifying vernal pools, evaluating impacts and avoiding and minimizing impacts to the extent practicable will continue as access to more parcels become available. Additional vernal pool surveys are scheduled for the spring of 2016, and the results of these surveys will be communicated in supplemental filings as necessary. jj. Tennessee has attempted to avoid and minimize impacts to vegetation communities of special concern, habitats supporting rare plant species and vernal pools by siting aboveground and appurtenant facilities within or adjacent to the permanent ROW and by selecting previously disturbed areas for use as contractor yards. Vernal pool surveys are ongoing and a detailed assessment of vernal pool impacts will be provided in a supplemental filing. kk. Detailed survey results are provided directly to the corresponding agency and are included in the Privileged and Confidential Volume III.	hh. RR3, Tables 3.3-1 and 3.3-2 ii. RR3, Sections 3.3.2.4.3 and 3.3.2.5.1 RR2, Attachment 2h jj. RR3, Section 3.3.3 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing kk. Volume III, Appendix BB Volume III, Appendix FF	hh. 3-75 and 3-77 ii. 3-84 and 3-85 to 3-86 Attachment 2h jj. 3-86 to 3-87 kk. N/A

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>ll. a seeding plan (or plans) for the stabilization of construction areas;</p> <p>mm. a discussion of the potential construction and operation impacts on migratory bird species of special concern and their habitats that contains:</p> <p>i. an evaluation of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on these species along with the impacts' expected duration (short-term, long-term, or permanent);</p> <p>ii. Project-specific conservation measures and best management practices developed in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to avoid and minimize impacts on these species; and</p> <p>iii. documentation of the relevant consultations with the FWS.</p>	<p>ll. Due to the large scale of this Project over multiple ecological regions across the northeastern U.S., it is likely that one particular seed mixture will not be appropriate for use across the entire Project length. Therefore, Tennessee has consulted with the NRCS, the Soil and Water Conservation Districts ("SWCD"), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") for guidance and approval on appropriate erosion control seed mixtures needed to stabilize disturbed areas until indigenous species can be re-established. Tennessee will continue to review all recommendations and develop a plan for stabilization of construction areas with and/or without seed mixtures.</p> <p>mm. A discussion of potential impacts to migratory birds has been provided in the "Construction and Operations Impacts" sections for both Wildlife and Endangered and Threatened Species. Cumulative Impacts have been addressed in the Cumulative Impacts section of Resource Report 3. Correspondence received through October 1, 2015 has been included in Volumes II and III.</p>	<p>ll. RR3, Section 3.3.4.3</p> <p>mm. RR3, Section 3.2.2.7</p> <p>RR3, Section 3.4.2.1.8</p> <p>RR3, Section 3.5.2.2</p> <p>Volume II, Appendix B</p> <p>Volume III, Appendix BB</p>	<p>ll. 3-89 to 3-90</p> <p>mm. 3-57 and 3-58</p> <p>3-111 to 3-112</p> <p>3-121 to 3-122</p>
43	<p>General – Provide information regarding the extent of improvement (e.g., paving, widening, etc.) that would be necessary for all access roads proposed to pass through significant or sensitive wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Alternative access was selected to avoid impacts to sensitive wildlife habitats when possible. When impacts were unavoidable they were minimized by using existing paved roads, farm roads, agricultural sites and other disturbed open lands, and developed areas. Tennessee will continue to evaluate access roads with the appropriate agencies to develop alternatives or applicable conservation measures. Table 8.1-6 in Resource Report 8 provides a list of all access roads by Project milepost, whether a modification is needed, and what the cover types and total area affected during construction would be.</p>	<p>RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.1-6</p>	<p>8b-111 to 8b-118</p>
44	<p>General – Provide a discussion of invasive insects (e.g., emerald ash borer, Asian long-horned beetle) known to be problematic within the Project area. The discussion should include a description of the insects, their occurrence within the Project area, any quarantine areas that would be crossed by the Project, any potential impacts of the Project on invasive species populations and distribution, and measures to avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts due to invasive insects associated with the Project.</p>	<p>An Invasive Species Management Plan has been prepared for each state and is included in the state-specific ECPs.</p>	<p>Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 9</p>	<p>N/A</p>
45	<p>Section 3.1.3 (pages 3-15 and 3-16) – Expand upon, and provide citations for, the discussion of the potential effects on the survival and fitness of fish and aquatic wildlife resources associated with the removal of riparian vegetation at stream crossings and the duration of these effects. Include the expected timeframe within which invertebrate populations would recolonize the crossing area to pre-construction conditions.</p>	<p>Tennessee will stabilize and restore the stream substrates, banks and riparian zones immediately following completion of construction in accordance with Tennessee's Project-specific Procedures. Tennessee continues to consult with federal, state, and local agencies and will implement any additional permit conditions required by these agencies. Additional information regarding the potential effects on the survival and fitness of fish and aquatic wildlife resources associated with the removal of riparian vegetation at stream crossings will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>RR3, Section 3.1.3</p> <p>RR3, Section 3.1.4</p> <p>Volume II, Appendix H</p> <p>To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>3-16 to 3-18</p> <p>3-18 to 3-20</p>
46	<p>Section 3.1.4 (page 3-18) – Include a discussion about the potential effects of HDD crossing methods on riparian habitat at all waterbody crossings. Include a discussion of potential HDD crossing impacts on the floodplain forest habitat at the Farmington River.</p>	<p>Details regarding potential effects of the HDD crossing method are described in the Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan included as a part of the state-specific ECPs. Tennessee is currently planning a 1,570-foot HDD beneath the Farmington River. As currently designed, the only proposed impacts at this locations are associated with the HDD entry/exit pad located south of the river, which will impact approximately 0.13 acres of forested wetlands. These impacts are located outside of the critical floodplain forest habitat as mapped by the state, but are within the limits of field delineated wetlands that border on the Farmington River.</p>	<p>Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 5</p> <p>RR3, Section 3.3.2.5</p>	<p>3-84 to 3-85</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
47	<p>Section 3.1.4 (page 3-18) – Comments from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and FWS (April 24, 2015 and May 15, 2015, respectively) suggest planting trees during restoration in places where forested vegetation would be removed adjacent to waterbody crossings. Clarify whether or not Tennessee Gas would comply with this request to plant trees at applicable waterbody crossings.</p> <p>The Project would cross more than 400 miles of vegetated land, which could cause a reduction in the populations of honey bees and other pollinators.</p>	<p>Tennessee will stabilize and restore the stream substrates, banks and riparian zones immediately following completion of construction in accordance with Tennessee's Project-specific Procedures. Tennessee continues to consult with federal, state, and local agencies and will implement any additional permit conditions required by these agencies.</p> <p>Clearing of vegetation will permanently reduce available habitat cover and food sources for certain species of wildlife (i.e., those that primarily rely on forested habitats). However, following a relatively short period of regeneration within the temporary workspace and permanently maintained ROWs, there will be more terrestrial grassland and shrubland habitats that provide important cover and a greater diversity and density of food sources for a different complex of wildlife species. ROW corridors have been demonstrated to provide a greater plant species richness that provides nectar and pollen resources, important for many species of moths and butterflies and an assortment of wild bees.</p>	<p>RR3, Section 3.1.3 RR3, Section 3.1.4 Volume II, Appendix H</p> <p>RR3, Section 3.2.2.7</p>	<p>3-16 to 3-18 3-18 to 3-20</p> <p>3-57 to 3-58</p>
48	<p>Section 3.1.4 (page 3-18) - Describe the feasibility of adding seeds that support pollinators into the mixes used to restore construction workspaces. Provide copies of Tennessee Gas' consultations with the relevant federal and/or state regulatory agencies, and update the state-specific ECPs, as necessary. Include any measures that would protect pollinators in the ECPs, which could include, but is not limited to, removal of invasive species by more manual or mechanical means rather than chemical (herbicides/pesticides).</p>	<p>Due to the large scale of this Project over multiple ecological regions across the northeastern U.S., it is likely that one particular seed mixture will not be appropriate for use across the entire Project length. Therefore, Tennessee has consulted with the NRCS, the SWCD, and USFWS for guidance and approval on appropriate erosion control seed mixtures needed to stabilize disturbed areas until indigenous species can be re-established. Tennessee will continue to review all recommendations and develop a plan for stabilization of construction areas with and/or without seed mixtures. Tennessee does not use herbicides as part of routine vegetation maintenance along the ROW. Manual application of herbicides may be used in specific circumstances to control poisonous plants, such as poison ivy or as part of an approved Invasive Species Management Plan. In these limited circumstances all herbicide use is as allowed by the applicable jurisdictional agencies and with landowner approval. Agency correspondence received through October 1, 2015 has been provided in Volumes II and III. Additional information regarding seed mixes and restoration will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p>	<p>RR3, Section 3.3.4.3 Volume II, Appendix B Volume III, Appendix BB To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p>	<p>3-89 to 3-90</p>
49	<p>Section 3.2.2.3.7 (page 3-39) – Provide an explanation regarding why the Project centerline would not be co-located immediately adjacent the existing utility right-of-way located in the Montague Plains Wildlife Management Area (WMA; i.e., the proposed Project route is separated from the existing right-of-way by an approximately 100- to 140-foot strip of primarily forested habitat).</p> <p>Discuss any impacts the Project would have on the use of prescribed fires to manage habitat at the Montague Plains WMA and other similarly managed areas. Discuss potential impacts that prescribed burning in the vicinity of the Project could have on Project construction and operation.</p>	<p>The Project centerline is co-located immediately adjacent to the existing utility ROW located in the Montague Plains Wildlife Management Area. However, the power company does not maintain the full width of their easement which makes it appear as if the proposed ROW for the NED Pipeline is not adjacent.</p> <p>Pipeline operation will not impact or be impacted by use of prescribed fires for habitat management.</p>	<p>RR3, Section 3.2.2.3.8</p>	<p>3-44 to 3.45</p>
50	<p>Section 3.2.2.5.3 (page 3-48) – Discuss the potential Project-related impacts on wildlife habitat and vegetation at Talcott Mountain State Park and explain why the proposed 120-foot crossing of this park could not be avoided.</p>	<p>The crossing of Talcott Mountain State Park is along an existing pipeline ROW to minimize any impacts. Any changes to the existing landscape will be minor and confined to minimal widening of the existing cleared ROW as necessary for safe construction and operation of the pipeline. Disturbed areas will be restored after construction is completed as described in the Project-specific ECP for Connecticut. Tennessee is reviewing this crossing and impacts to the area and will work with the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("CTDEEP") to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to this area.</p>	<p>RR8, Section 8.3.1.1.2 Volume II, Appendix N</p>	<p>8-63 to 8-64</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
51	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Include a more detailed discussion, with citations from recent literature, on the potential effects of the Project on wildlife movement and displacement, including examples of specific species that may be affected depending on the time of year, the relative sensitivity of the species, and seasonal habitat selection.	Direct and indirect impacts to wildlife have been provided. Additional detailed discussion, as requested, will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR3, Section 3.2.2.7 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	3-57 to 3-58
52	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Discuss potential impacts on wildlife associated with air pollution and heat generated from the operation of Project aboveground facilities.	Potential impacts to wildlife associated with air pollution and heat generated from the operation of aboveground facilities will be provided in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
53	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Include a more detailed discussion, with documentation from agency consultations, of the steps Tennessee Gas would take to avoid and minimize impacts on wildlife, including but not restricted to: nn. minimization measures for habitat fragmentation impacts, including those on forest interior dwelling species; oo. timing restrictions on tree removal and how Tennessee Gas would handle tree removal with regard to tree-clearing restrictions in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; pp. whether or not Tennessee Gas would conduct tree surveys prior to tree removal (e.g., to assess presence of nesting sensitive and/or rare species); and qq. measures Tennessee Gas would take to minimize Project impacts to smaller species of wildlife (e.g., falling into or becoming trapped in open trenches).	nn. In order to protect migratory birds, wide-ranging mammals and other interior forest dependent wildlife, Tennessee has co-located approximately 85% of the Project with existing utility corridors. This greatly reduces the effects of forest fragmentation, the amount of edge habitat created by forest cutting, minimizes the amount of forest interior reduction for each individual forest patch, and minimizes the amount of habitat conversion into open land cover types. Impacts to interior forest dependent wildlife and migratory birds will be reduced during the construction phase of the Project through surveys by qualified botanists and biologists, and through adherence to timing restrictions recommended by various agencies. oo. Tennessee will implement timing restrictions on tree removal to avoid and minimize impacts to wildlife as required through consultations with federal and state. pp. Tennessee is currently consulting with federal and state agencies to determine appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for Project construction. Tennessee will provide the results of the consultation in a supplemental filing. qq. In order to minimize the risk of entrapping wildlife, Tennessee will minimize the length of time the trench will be open to the extent practicable.	nn. RR3, Section 3.2.2.9 oo. RR3, Section 3.2.2.7 pp. To be provided in a Supplemental Filing qq. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N	nn. 3-59 oo. 3-58 to 3-59 pp. N/A qq. N/A
54	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Discuss whether Tennessee Gas would conduct 24-hour or nighttime operations using artificial lighting that could cause disturbance to nocturnal wildlife, including bats. Identify mitigation measures to minimize impacts.	Tennessee is currently consulting with federal and state agencies to determine appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for Project construction and operation, including nighttime lighting. Tennessee will provide the results of the consultation in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
55	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Discuss and provide citations from recent literature: rr. the expected timeframes for the revegetation of Project areas that would be allowed to revert back naturally to their original condition. Include timeframes for all vegetative community types that would be impacted; ss. the likely successional progression of vegetation and wildlife at the sites during these timeframes based on the restoration actions followed in Tennessee Gas' Plan; and tt. the effects of these successional changes on wildlife species that are likely to be present at the sites (i.e., pre-construction).	Descriptions of wetland restoration techniques are included in Tennessee's Project-specific ECPs for each state and in Tennessee's Procedures. Tennessee will conduct follow-up inspections of disturbed areas after the first and second growing seasons (normally months 3 to 9 and months 15 to 21 after seeding, respectively) to determine the success of revegetation in upland and agricultural areas. Monitoring in wetland areas will be completed annually for the first 3 years after construction or until wetland revegetation is successful. At the end of 3 years after construction, a report will be filed with FERC identifying the status of the wetland revegetation efforts.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N Volume II, Appendix H	N/A
56	Section 3.2.3.1 (page 3-51) – Clarify whether wetland restoration plans would be developed for the restoration of wetlands affected by the Project. If so, include the plans or identify the schedule for when they would be provided.	Descriptions of wetland restoration techniques are included in Tennessee's Project-specific ECPs for each state and in Tennessee's Project-specific Procedures.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N Volume II, Appendix H	N/A

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
57	Section 3.3.2.4.1 (page 3-75) – Provide the location of the Emergent Marsh – Shrub Swamp natural community system near Cheshire, New Hampshire relative to the Project and discuss potential impacts on the system, if applicable.	This system is greater than 100 feet from the Project limits of work. Standard erosion control systems will be in place for work in the vicinity of all wetlands and no impacts to this community are expected.	RR3, Section 3.3.2.4.1	3-82
58	Section 3.3.2.4.1 (page 3-76) – Identify the location of the Mixed Pine-Red Oak Woodland natural community in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire relative to the Project along with a discussion of potential impacts on the community along with mitigation measures, as applicable.  Clarify whether avoidance of the Red Maple – Sensitive Fern Swamp that would be crossed by the Project in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire has been considered as a measure to avoid impacts to this natural community system.	No impacts will occur to the Mixed Pine-Red Oak Woodland natural community in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire due to a Project modification in this area needed to avoid impacts to Ponemah Bog Wildlife Sanctuary.  This Red Maple – Sensitive Fern Swamp community was identified is located within the limits of the proposed Project. The Project centerline crosses this community for approximately 1,221 linear feet. Tennessee will work with the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau to minimize impacts in this area.	RR3, Section 3.3.2.4.2	3-83
59	Section 3.3.4.1 (page 3-80) – Tennessee Gas has stated that it plans to clear all approved workspace areas. Clarify whether or not any trees within an approved workspace would be saved (i.e., not felled) and include a description of the circumstances in which this would occur.	Any trees that are to be saved will be sufficiently marked (i.e., flagging and construction fencing) before ROW clearing begins. This may include ornamental shrubs, trees, or structures that are of special concern by landowners, and identified through consultation and protected through individual landowner agreements with Tennessee prior to construction.	RR3, Section 3.3.4.1	3-87 to 3-88
60	Section 3.3.4.1 (page 3-80) – For felled trees that inadvertently land in waterbodies or outside of the right-of-way that cannot be removed immediately, provide measures that would be taken to prevent adverse impacts associated with the fallen vegetation from occurring to resources or landowners prior to its removal along with an estimated timeline for its removal.	Trees that have inadvertently fallen into waterbodies or beyond the ROW will be removed immediately, if possible, and care will be taken to avoid damage to resources and landowners property. For example, ropes, excavator grapple attachments, feller bunchers, or small cranes may be used to lift material from these areas, or material may cut into smaller pieces and removed by hand if necessary.	RR3, Section 3.3.4.1	3-87 to 3-88
61	Section 3.3.4.1 (page 3-80) – Include a discussion of the wildlife habitat that could be provided by if landowners or land-management agencies requested timber stacks and clarify whether or not the use of timber stacks is proposed as a mitigation measure to offset impacts on wildlife habitat.	While Tennessee does not plan to routinely use timber stacks as wildlife habitat, this may be considered an option on a case-by-case basis if specifically requested by an individual landowner or land managing agency and only if use of the timber stack does not compromise waterbody or wetland areas.	RR3, Section 3.3.4.1	3-87 to 3-88
62	Section 3.3.4.2 (page 3-80) – Clarify whether or not the disposal/removal of chipped woody vegetation would be held to the same state-specific and U.S. Forest Service guidelines as firewood with regards to preventing the spread of invasive insects (e.g., the emerald ash borer).	Tennessee has prepared Project state-specific Invasive Species Management Plans to avoid transport of invasive insects during disposal of vegetation.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, N, Attachment 9	N/A
63	Section 3.4.1.3 (page 3-88) – Clarify the rationale for the assertion that no impacts would occur to the significant natural community of the Emmond Pond Bog Preserve.	At its closest point the Project limits-of-work are more than 300 feet south of the Emmonds Pond Bog Preserve property boundary, and more than 800 feet south of the wetland that the bog is situated within. No impacts will occur to this parcel, the bog, or its natural community, or the wetland that it is associated with.	RR3, Section 3.4.1.3	3-96
64	Section 3.4.2.1.7 (page 3-103) – Discuss measures that Tennessee Gas would implement to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to eagle nests, should any nests be found during the pre-construction surveys.	Tennessee plans to conduct habitat assessment of winter roosting sites and also will conduct additional nest surveys the spring season immediately prior to construction, as more new nests are likely to be added to the landscape. Tennessee will continue to consult with USFWS and CTDEEP Wildlife Division to develop impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as needed, which will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR3, Section 3.4.2.1.7 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	3-110 to 3-111

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
65	Section 3.4.2.2.3 (page 3-106) – Identify measures that would be taken to minimize or avoid impacts on the three Massachusetts state-listed plants identified by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) as Species A, B, and C due to their sensitivity to collection.	A rare plant survey protocol has been submitted and approved by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program ("NHESP"), and surveys have begun where access is available. Tennessee will continue to conduct surveys for all rare plants and coordinate with NHESP on best ways to avoid and minimize impacts to rare plants within the construction footprint. Exact details on these measures will be determined once rare plants have been identified, extents mapped, and consultation with NHESP are complete, and will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR3, Section 3.4.2.2.3 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	3-114 to 3-115
66	Section 3.4.2.2.3 (page 3-106) – Discuss and provide citations from recent literature on the effects electroshocking on fish may have if used as a method for relocation as suggested by the NHESP (e.g., stress response to electroshocking, effects on survival and fitness). Discuss feasible and/or preferable alternative methods of relocation.	Tennessee will continue to consult with NHESP regarding their suggestion of using electroshocking at the time of construction to relocate fish out of the work zone. Additional information on potential impacts and alternative methods of relocation will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR3, Section 3.4.2.2.3 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	3-114 to 3-115
67	Section 3.4.2.2.5 (page 3-108) – Clarify whether or not Tennessee Gas would attempt to retain large-diameter coniferous and deciduous trees to minimize long-term impacts on the hoary and silver haired bats, as recommended by the Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base. If this measure would be implemented, discuss the process by which Tennessee Gas would determine whether to retain or remove such trees.	Tennessee will minimize tree removal to the extent possible while maintaining a safe workspace. Tennessee is continuing consultations state agencies and will provide results of the consultations in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
68	Section 3.4.2.2.5 (page 3-108) – Clarify whether or not Tennessee Gas would adhere to the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection recommendations listed in section 3.4.2.2.5 to avoid/minimize potential impacts on the eastern ribbon snake, state-listed plants, threatened and endangered mussels, the blue-spotted and Jefferson salamanders, grassland bird species, and the pine barren tiger beetle.	Tennessee has adhered to the CTDEEP's recommendations regarding avoiding and minimizing impacts to state-listed species. Results of requested surveys are provided in Volume III. Additionally, Tennessee will continue to coordinate with CTDEEP with regards to species-specific surveys and impact avoidance and minimization measures and will provide updated information in a supplemental filing.	RR3, Section 3.4.2.2.5 Volume III, Appendix FF To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	3-116 to 3-118
69	Identify if any of the FWS offices involved (Pennsylvania, New York, and New England) have identified a lead office for consultation purposes.	As of the date of this filing, none of the USFWS offices involved have identified a lead office for consultation purposes.	N/A	N/A
70	Figure 3.2-1 (figure 4 of 11) – For the portion of the Fitchburg Lateral between MPs 5.0 and 14.0, explain the feasibility of avoiding BioMap2-mapped sensitive resources by adjusting the route to cross nearby areas with few to no mapped resources.	Tennessee is working to avoid and minimize impacts on sensitive wildlife species and their designated habitats through careful Project design and site selection, including extensive co-location with existing facilities; consultation with appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and private organizations; detailed environmental surveys conducted by qualified wetland scientists, wildlife biologists, and botanists. The Project centerline of the Fitchburg Lateral as currently proposed follows the mapped edges of Core Habitats and is co-located with an existing utility through this segment. This will minimize the effects of habitat fragmentation within BioMap2 Core Habitats and the adjacent landscape following construction of the Project. Impacts to BioMap2 Critical Natural Landscapes are also minimized through co-location with the existing utility. In addition, relocation to the east is constrained due to extensive areas of protected lands (Townsend State Forest) and additional BioMap2 Core habitats and supporting landscape, and shifting to the west will bring the line through downtown Ashby, Ashby and Fitchburg Reservoirs, and Fitchburg State forest.	RR3, Section 3.2.2.7 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	3-57 to 3-58
<b>Resource Report 4 - Cultural Resources</b>				
71	Section 4.2.1 and Appendix DD – Include all new and previously unfilled correspondence, meeting notes, phone logs, or emails between Tennessee Gas and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs).	Updated in Resource Report 4 Volume III, Appendix DD.	RR4, Section 4.2.1 Volume III, Appendix DD	4-3 to 4-5



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
72	Section 4.2.2 and Appendix EE – Include all new or previously unfiled correspondence, meeting notes, phone logs, or emails between Tennessee Gas and interested Indian tribes.	Updated in Resource Report 4 Volume III, Appendix EE.	RR4, Section 4.2.2 Volume III, Appendix EE	4-5 to 4-9
73	Section 4.2.2 – Include an update on the status of on-the-ground cultural resources surveys conducted by Indian tribes along the proposed pipeline route, organized by pipeline segment (with mileposts) including the state-county-tribe-miles inventoried and survey results. If tribal surveys are not completed in time for the application, provide the schedule for when all pending survey results will be filed.	Tribal field surveys are currently ongoing and are expected to conclude at the same time as the archaeological surveys. Section 4.4.1 describes tribal participation by Project segment. The Stockbridge Munsee-Mohican Tribe conducted fieldwork in Rensselaer County, New York, on June 9, 2015, and again during August 2015. The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) conducted fieldwork in Hartford County, Connecticut, from July to August 2015, and in Rockingham and Cheshire Counties, New Hampshire, from August to September 2015. The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) has conducted fieldwork in Berkshire, Hampshire, and Franklin counties, Massachusetts, and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe conducted surface surveys in the Project in Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Middlesex, Essex, and Worcester counties, Massachusetts, during August 2015. To date, none of the participating tribes has provided survey results/miles surveyed to Tennessee.	RR4, Section 4.4.1	4-11 to 4-51
74	Attachment 4a – File comments from the SHPOs and Indian tribes on Tennessee Gas' Draft Unanticipated Discovery Plans, and revised state-specific plans that address those comments.	Written Unanticipated Discover Plan comments from State Historic Preservation Offices ("SHPOs") are filed in RR4 Volume III, Appendix DD. Written comments from tribes are filed in RR4 Volume III, Appendix EE. Revised state-specific plans are filed in RR4, Attachment 4a.	Volume III, Appendix DD Volume III, Appendix EE RR4, Attachment 4a	Attachment 4a
75	Include copies of the Project-specific cultural resources Overview and Survey reports that cover the entire direct area of potential effect and meet the requirements outlined in sections V. and VI. of the FERC's Office of Energy Projects Guidelines for Reporting on Cultural Resources Investigations for Pipeline Projects (December 2002 version). Document that Tennessee Gas also submitted copies of these reports to the appropriate SHPOs, interested Indian tribes, and FERC-designated other consulting parties, and file comments on the reports. If Tennessee Gas' surveys are not completed in time for the application, provide the schedule for when all pending survey results will be filed.	Report submissions to SHPOs are filed in RR4 Volume III, Appendix DD. Report submissions to tribes (sent in tandem with SHPO submissions) are included in the weekly tribal updates filed in RR4 Volume III, Appendix EE.	Volume III, Appendix CC Volume III, Appendix DD Volume III, Appendix EE	N/A
76	Include a response to the January 15, 2015 letter from the town of Wilmington, Massachusetts expressing concerns about impacts to the town-owned Colonel Joshua Harden Tavern and Museum. Indicate if the Project would affect this site, including the distance between the pipeline and the building, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	The Colonel Joshua Harnden Tavern and Museum is located 0.60 mile from the Project and is therefore outside the Project.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.3.3	4-113
77	Include a response to the February 5, 2015 letter from Carol Iodice of Mason, New Hampshire expressing concerns about impacts on the historic Pickity Place restaurant. Indicate if the Project would affect this site, including the distance between the pipeline and the building, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	Pickity Place restaurant is located 0.30 mile from the Project. There will be no direct effect on the property; it will be surveyed and documented by architectural historians to assess indirect effects.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.4.1	4-129 to 4-130
78	Include a response to the February 17, 2015 letter from Phoebe Bushway expressing concerns about impacts on the West Street and Hilltop cemeteries in Plainfield, Massachusetts. Indicate if the Project would affect these cemeteries, including the distance between the pipeline and the cemetery boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	West Street Cemetery is located more than 600' from the project centerline; however, it will be included in the survey to assess possible indirect effects. Hilltop Cemetery is more than 0.25 mile from the Project and is therefore outside the Project.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.3.1	4-87 to 4-88

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
79	Include a response to the May 25, 2015 letter from Mark Wolterbeek expressing concerns about impacts on the Rindge, New Hampshire Smallpox Cemetery. Indicate if the Project would affect the cemetery, including the distance between the pipeline and the cemetery boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	Cemetery is identified in New Hampshire Phase IA report (RR4 Volume III, Appendix CC). Current action involves verification of the location during ongoing cultural resource investigations of the Project survey area in New Hampshire. Once the location is verified, the potential effect can be discussed.	Volume III, Appendix CC	N/A
80	Include a response to the July 28, 2015 letter from the town of Northfield, Massachusetts expressing concerns about impacts on the Swan and Sites homesteads within the Northfield Brush Mountain Conservation Area. Indicate if the Project would affect these sites, including the distance between the pipeline and the site boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	The conservation area is addressed in Resource Report 8 with regard to impacts on land use. Current action involves verification of the locations of both sites. Once the locations are verified, the potential effects will be discussed. If the sites are located within 200' of the pipeline centerline, they will be surveyed and documented by architectural historians to assess effects. The archaeological resources noted in the letter are on file with Massachusetts Historical Commission and are located approximately 1,000 feet west-northwest of the Project centerline. Because the two sites are located outside the survey area, no impacts are expected to occur.	RR8, Section 8.3.1.1.3 RR4, Section 4.4.1.3	8-66 4-36 to 4-45
81	Include a response to the July 28, 2015 letter from Susan Williams expressing concerns about impacts on the New Ipswich, New Hampshire Center Village Historic District. Indicate if the Project would affect the Historic District, including the distance between the pipeline/aboveground facilities and the District boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	The northernmost boundary of the New Ipswich Village Historic District is more than 1 mile from the Project, and therefore this site is outside the Project.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.4.1	4-129 to 4-130
82	Include a response to the August 12, 2015 letter from the town of Deerfield, Massachusetts expressing concerns about impacts on the historic site of Old Deerfield. Indicate if the Project would affect this site, including the distance between the pipeline and the site boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	The northernmost boundary of the Historic Deerfield is more than 0.60 mile from the Project, and therefore the site is outside the Project.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.3.1	4-87 to 4-88
83	Include a response to the August 13, 2015 letter from the town of Dalton, Massachusetts expressing concerns about impacts on the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area. Indicate if the Project would affect this area, including the distance between the pipeline and the area boundaries, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	Although the Project will cross through the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in portions of Hancock, Lanesborough, and Dalton, Massachusetts, Tennessee has co-located the Project with an existing utility corridor through this segment to minimize the impact to the National Heritage Area. All historic buildings and sites located within 200 feet of the Project centerline will be surveyed and documented by architectural historians to assess effects.	RR4, Section 4.4.2.3.1	4-87 to 4-88
84	The following people stated that they reside in historic houses near the pipeline route: Lawrence DeVito of Mason, New Hampshire; Kathleen Rose of Merrimack, New Hampshire; Kaela Law of Pelham, New Hampshire; Lester Garvin of Ashfield, Massachusetts; Tina Hanson of Rindge, New Hampshire; Libby Reilly of Nassau, New York; Robert Borden of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire; Elizabeth Tatro of Lanesborough, Massachusetts; Peter LeCount of Mason, New Hampshire; Barbara Markessinis of Hancock, Massachusetts; Holly Woodward of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire; John Angleman of Ashfield, Massachusetts; and Peter Cottrell of Stephentown, New York. Indicate if the Project would affect those houses, including the distance from the edge of the construction work area to each building, and discuss any necessary measures to avoid or minimize impacts.	A response to each comment/historic property location has been added to all relevant sections in Chapter 4.4.2.	RR4, Section 4.4.2	4-51 to 4-139

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 5 - Socioeconomics</b>				
85	General – Include all information listed in RR 5 or the Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports matrix as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: uu. section 5.8 (page 5-12) – Environmental Justice discussion for aboveground facilities. Include a table that includes a breakdown of minority and low-income populations near each facility; vv. section 5.8 (page 5-12) – Environmental Justice discussion for both pipeline and aboveground facilities at the municipal level; and ww. section 5.9.1 (table 5.9-1) – Include the estimated increase in property tax revenues and the estimated yearly escalation for Hampden County, Massachusetts.	uu. The racial composition and poverty levels of the states, counties, and municipalities in the Project area are provided in Table 5.9 1. vv. The racial composition and poverty levels of the states, counties, and municipalities in the Project area are provided in Table 5.9 1. ww. Estimated property tax revenues for Hampden County, Massachusetts have been provided in Table 5.10-1.	uu. RR5, Attachment 5a, Table 5.9-1 vv. RR5, Attachment 5a, Table 5.9-1 ww. RR5, Table 5.10-1	uu. 5a-11 to 5a-21 vv. 5a-11 to 5a-21 ww. 5-24 to 5-25
86	Section 5.1.3 (page 5-4) – The text states that there would be a peak workforce of 5,247, that 50 percent of workers would be non-local, and that none of the non-local workers would bring families. Clarify how the estimated temporary population increase of 3,000 is calculated.	Tennessee has revised the numbers reflected in Section 5.1.3.	RR5, Section 5.1.3	5-3 to 5-4
87	Section 5.4 (page 5-11) – Specify the contractor yards and “Park-N-Ride areas” that would be used for parking and discuss traffic management and mitigation measures at these areas. For the public Park-N-Ride areas, discuss their capacity and their ability to accommodate the extra vehicles and still provide parking to the public.	At this time, Tennessee does not anticipate using any public Park-N-Ride facilities; therefore, the Project will have no impact on Park-N-Ride capacity.	RR5, Section 5.4	5-11 to 5-13
88	Section 5.9.1 (page 5-23) and Section 5.9.2.1 (page 5-25) – Clarify the local expenditures during construction. xx. page 5-23 lists the estimated expenditures by non-local workers on local goods and services as \$38,027,439 and also lists the estimate for locally purchased construction materials as \$38,027,439. Confirm whether these estimates are identical and the basis for the calculations. yy. page 5-25 lists the estimated expenditure by workers in the local communities as \$64,713,600 during construction. Clarify the difference between this estimate and the estimated expenditure of non-local workers of \$38,027,439 that is stated in section 5.9.1. Explain how each of these estimates is calculated.	xx. Tennessee has reviewed and revised the text. Construction of the Project will also result in increased state and local sales tax revenues associated with the purchase of some construction materials, as well as goods and services, by the construction workforce. Tennessee estimates the total approximate cost of materials to be \$781,347,500 with 5 percent (or \$39,067,375) being spent on locally purchased materials. yy. Tennessee has reviewed and revised the text. Each temporary worker is expected to spend approximately \$800 per week for local living expenses for such items as temporary housing and meals. Based on an estimated three year construction period, the total approximate expenditure in the local communities is expected to be over \$461,385,600.	xx. RR5, Section 5.10.1 yy. RR5, Section 5.10.2.2	xx. 5-24 to 5-25 yy. 5-26 to 5-27
89	Section 5.9.1 (table 5.9-1) – Clarify how the “Estimated Escalation” column is calculated.	Estimated escalation is calculated based on 1% per year for all states except Massachusetts, which is calculated based on 2% per year.	RR5, Table 5.10-1	5-24 to 5-25
90	Develop a traffic and transportation plan that provides an estimate of the anticipated number of vehicles, trips, travel routes, and timeframes for construction. Break the construction estimate down by activity (e.g., stringing, water hauling). Describe in detail the pipeline construction vehicle traffic and potential impacts, especially when road closures would be required and an explanation of why a reasonable detour could not be used. Include a section addressing safety and how access would be provided to residences, businesses, and schools during detours and road closures.	Through continued communications with landowners and other appropriate stakeholders during the certificate process, Tennessee will be developing a detailed traffic and transportation plan. Specific traffic and transportation plans may be developed as appropriate for specific portions of the Project as a result of these stakeholder communications. Information on traffic and transportation plans will be provided as developed in supplemental filings during the certificate process.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
91	Provide documentation of consultation with the various affected agencies and commercial businesses within each county impacted by construction. Describe any recommendations by the various agencies and landowners in how to alert the public of construction and any requirements regarding minimizing impacts related to construction.	All correspondence is provided in Volume II, Appendix B. Documentation of notifications will be provided as they become available. Periodic newsletters are currently used to notify stakeholders of Project information and will continue to be used during construction. Additionally, Tennessee’s Public Affairs group meets regularly with municipalities, business owners, and Chambers of Commerce to provide input regarding the Project.	Volume II, Appendix B To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	N/A

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
92	Estimate direct tax base benefits for each township/county along the pipeline route and for aboveground facilities.	Estimated property tax revenues have been reported for each county .	RR5, Table 5.10-1	5-24 to 5-25
<b>Resource Report 6 - Geological Resources</b>				
93	General – Include all information listed in RR 6 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: zz. state mine database data for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut; aaa. the completed table, discussion, and additional requested information for oil and gas wells as specified in the Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports matrix; bbb. potential blasting areas by MP;	zz. State data for mines has been used for Pennsylvania and New York. USGS Data has been used for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. USGS Mineral Resources database was used to identify and locate nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in Massachusetts since the State GIS data, Massachusetts Office of Geographic Information (“MassGIS”), does not currently provide mineral resources. USGS Mineral Resources database was utilized to identify and locate nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in New Hampshire since the State GIS database, New Hampshire Geographic Information System, does not currently provide mineral resources, mines and quarries, and New Hampshire Geological Survey has yet to provide a list of quarries within the vicinity of the Project facilities. USGS Mineral Resources data was used to identify and located nonfuel mineral resources, mines and quarries, in Connecticut since State GIS, CTDEEP GIS, mineral resources, mines and quarries, is not currently available. aaa. Complete information for oil and gas wells in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and aboveground and appurtenant facilities has been provided.	zz. RR6, Section 6.3.1 RR6, Table 6.3-1 aaa. RR6, Section 6.3.2 RR6, Tables 6.3-6 through 6.3-10	zz. 6-36 6-37 to 6-40 aaa. 6-53 to 6-54 6-55 to 6-61
	ccc. Unanticipated Discovery Plan (with regards to paleontological resources); and ddd. soil liquefaction analysis for the proposed Project in Connecticut.	bbb. Potential blasting areas are equivalent to those areas having shallow depth to bedrock (less than 5 feet) presented in Table 6.2 1 in Attachment 6b. Potential blasting locations are identified using available mapping and soils data provided by the NRCS, Web Soil Survey (USDA-NRCS 2014b) and will be field verified prior to construction. Tennessee has provided potential blasting areas (those areas having shallow depth of bedrock or outcrops), but notes that a complete list of blasting locations can only be accurately determined in the field during the construction process. Blasting will generally be limited to areas of consolidated rock ccc. Tennessee has provided a Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains as part of the state-specific ECPs and submitted as an attachment to Resource Report 4. ddd. A soil liquefaction analysis for the propose Project in Connecticut has been provided.	bbb. RR6, Section 6.2 RR6, Attachment 6b, Table 6.2-1 RR6, Table 6.2-2 ccc. RR4, Attachment 4a ddd. RR6, Section 6.4.6.5	bbb. 6-31 to 6-36 6b-45 to 6b-57 6-34 to 6-35 ccc. Attachment 4a ddd. 6-93
94	General – Include a geotechnical review of the high-resolution aerial photographs along the Project that are known or may contain hazards resulting from steep slopes, potential landslides, and potential karst topography. The review should be conducted by a geotechnical engineer or certified geologist to provide the extent of the areas where hazards exist (or may exist) to Project construction and operation by MP. Identify mitigation measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts of the Project on these conditions as well as avoiding and minimizing the impacts of these conditions on Project construction and operation.	Tennessee is currently conducting a geotechnical review of the high-resolution aerial photographs along the Project. Once complete, Tennessee will provide a geotechnical review report in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
95	Section 6.3 (pages 6-37 through 6-39) – Include a table and discussion of oil and gas wells located within 0.25 mile of the pipelines, ATWS, aboveground facilities, and access roads by MP. Include the following information: eee. the total number of active, inactive (plugged), and proposed wells that would be within 0.25 mile of the Project; fff. measures that would protect any well and/or oil/gas gathering pipelines that may be located within the working area and/or located proximal to the working area; and ggg. measures that would be taken if any unknown and unmapped wells are encountered during construction.	eee. Tables have been included that identify all active, inactive, and proposed wells within 0.25 mile of the Project. fff. No work is proposed within close proximity to any oil and/or gas wells along the entirety of the Project route. ggg. It is unlikely that Tennessee will encounter an unknown oil or gas well within the construction workspace. However, if encountered Tennessee will contact the owner of the oil or gas well and work with them to avoid impacts and mitigate impacts as necessary.	eee. RR6, Tables 6.3-6 through 6.3-10 fff. RR6, Section 6.3.3 ggg. RR6, Section 6.3.2.1	eee. 6-55 to 6-61 fff. 6-62 ggg. 6-53
96	Section 6.4.2.7 (pages 6-49 through 6-53) – Include the following information with regards to seismic risk hhh. the specific standards that Tennessee Gas would design the pipeline to meet associated with seismic hazards; iii. mitigation methods and pipeline design criteria that would be used to prevent damage to the pipeline and minimize hazards from the pipeline in the event of a significant seismic event; and jjj. a table of past seismic events with a magnitude of 3.0 or greater that have occurred within 100 miles of the Project, including their magnitude, date, and distance from the proposed Project by state.	hhh. The pipeline and associated facilities will be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable U.S. Department of Transportation (“USDOT”) Office of Pipeline Safety (“OPS”) regulations regarding pipe wall thickness and strength, 49 CFR Part 192. The pipeline and facilities will be constructed to standards that will allow them to withstand probable seismic events within the seismic risk zones crossed by the Project, including applicable standards and design requirements in any additional federal and state regulations. iii. The pipeline and associated facilities will be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable USDOT OPS regulations regarding pipe wall thickness and strength, 49 Code of Federal Regulations (“CFR”) Part 192. The pipeline and facilities will be constructed to standards that will allow them to withstand probable seismic events within the seismic risk zones crossed by the Project, including applicable standards and design requirements in any additional federal and state regulations. jjj. Information regarding past seismic events will be provided in a supplemental filing.	hhh. RR6, Section 6.4.2.7 iii. RR6, Section 6.4.2.7 jjj. To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	hhh. 6-67 iii. 6-67 jjj. N/A
97	Table 6.4-3 (page 6b-95) – Identify any quaternary or Holocene faults crossed by the proposed Project and provide a class category for the listed faults. Identify if the faults are class A, B, C, or D within the U.S. Geological Survey fault data base, and include the age and when the most recent movement or displacement occurred for each.	There are no USGS class faults in the vicinity of the pipeline.	RR6, Section 6.4.3 RR6, Table 6.4-3	6-68 to 6-70 6-71 to 6-73
98	Section 6.4.4.7 (page 6-60) – Include the following information with regards to karst terrain. kkk. specify if blasting would be conducted in areas of karst topography and provide a discussion of potential contamination due to blasting in karst terrain and mitigation measures; ll. identify who would be responsible for identifying karst features and terrain during construction; mmm. specify if contractors and Environmental Inspectors would be trained to identify karst features; nnn. a discussion of the affects blasting may have on deeply fractured granite aquifers, such as those located near Merrimack and Hall, New Hampshire. Include a discussion of potential contamination of fractured granite bedrock aquifers; and ooo. a discussion of groundwater contamination due to blasting and the compounds used in blasting. Include a discussion of mitigation measures that would be used.	kkk. Blasting may be required in areas of limestone and/or karst geology. If voids or sinkholes are discovered during blasting or excavation, measures in the Karst Mitigation Plan will be followed. ll. Tennessee inspection staff will be responsible for identifying karst features and terrain during construction. Personnel will be trained prior to construction to identify karst features during construction. mmm. Personnel will be trained prior to construction to identify karst features during construction. nnn. Information regarding potential impacts on granite bedrock aquifers from blasting will be provided in a supplemental filing. ooo. A Blasting Plan will be prepared by the blasting contractor prior to construction. This plan will provide information regarding the compounds to be used during blasting and will comply with all local permits. The Blasting Plan will be provided with the Project Implementation Plan in a supplemental filing.	kkk. RR1, Section 1.3.2.6 RR6, Section 6.4.4.7 Volume II, Appendices K and L, Attachment 13 ll. RR6, Section 6.4.4.7 mmm. RR6, Section 6.4.4.7 nnn. To be provided in a Supplemental filing ooo. To be provided in a Supplemental filing	kkk. 1-110 to 1-111 6-78 to 6-80 ll. 6-78 to 6-80 mmm. 6-78 to 6-80 nnn. N/A ooo. N/A

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
99	Section 6.4.6.4 (page 6-71) – Due to the moderate seismic hazard in New Hampshire, confirm whether the soils crossed by the Project in New Hampshire are prone to soil liquefaction.	There may be some potential for ground settlement from liquefaction in this portion of the pipeline although the magnitude of liquefaction settlement displacements are minor compared to the displacements the pipeline experiences during installation.	RR6, Section 6.4.6.4	6-93
<b>Resource Report 7 - Soils</b>				
100	General – Include all information listed in RR 7 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: ppp. total acres that would be affected by Project construction and operation including active agricultural land, fallow agricultural land/field, managed forest land, and open field/open land; qqq. data regarding stony/rocky soils crossed by the Project; rrr. the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan; sss. data on soils with a low revegetation potential that would be crossed by the Project; and ttt. vulnerable soils tables in the state-specific ECPs.	ppp. Total acres during construction and operation (acres) are included in Resource Report 7 tables. qqq. Stony/rocky soils data is included in Resource Report 7 tables. rrr. The Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan has been renamed "Spill Prevention and Response Plan" and is included in the state-specific ECPs. (Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M and N). Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans will be provided prior to construction as required by federal and state agencies. sss. Low Revegetation potential has been updated in Resource Report 7 Tables. ttt. All tables have been included in the state-specific ECPs.	ppp. RR7, Attachment 7b qqq. RR7, Attachment 7b rrr. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 3 sss. RR7, Attachment 7b ttt. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N	ppp. Attachment 7b qqq. Attachment 7b rrr. N/A sss. Attachment 7b ttt. N/A
101	General – In addition to the detailed tables provided in RR 7, include summary tables that identify soil limitations that would be impacted by construction and operation of the Project. Provide a separate table for each type of Project component including pipeline facilities, aboveground facilities (including compressor stations, meter stations, and MLVs), access roads, ATWS, and contractor yards. Include both construction impacts and operational impacts in acres for all Project facilities. Provide impacts for the following: soil limitations, potential water erosion, potential wind erosion, stony rocky soils, shallow depth to bedrock, potential soil compaction, poor revegetation potential, poor drainage potential, and prime farmlands (including farmlands of statewide importance).  SEE TAB: RR7 SAMPLE TABLES	The following summary tables are included: Table 7.1-1 Summary of Impacts for the Pipeline Facilities (includes ROW and ATWS) Table 7.1-2 Summary of Soil Characteristics and Potential Impacts for Access Roads (Includes access roads) Table 7.1-3 Summary of Soil Characteristics and Potential Impacts for the Contractor Yards (includes contractor yards) 7.2-1 Summary of Soil Characteristics and Potential Impacts for Aboveground and Appurtenant Facilities (includes compressor stations, meter stations, MLVs, and Pig Facilities).  Construction and Operation Impacts are included in the tables. Tables include impacts are included for soil limitations, potential water erosion, potential wind erosion, stony rocky soils, shallow depth to bedrock, potential soil compaction, poor revegetation potential, poor drainage potential, and prime farmlands (including farmlands of statewide importance). No operation impacts are associated with the temporary contractor yards; therefore, they are not included in Table 7.1-3.	RR7, Attachment 7b, Tables 7.1-1, 7.1-2, 7.1-3, and 7.2-1	7b-1 to 7b-228

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
102	<p>General – Include the following information in each of the state-specific ECPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uuu. the mitigation measures that Tennessee Gas would use in soils that have a high stone and rock content;</li> <li>vvv. the procedures and measures developed in coordination with the appropriate state and local agencies to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive species, noxious weeds, and soil pests resulting from construction and restoration activities;</li> <li>www. the procedures and measures developed in coordination with or recommended by the appropriate state and local agencies with regard to erosion control and revegetation specifications; and</li> <li>xxx. the procedures and measures developed in coordination with or recommended by the appropriate state and local agencies with regards to drain tiles, irrigation systems, and grazing deferment.</li> </ul>	<p>uuu. Rock material 4 inches in size or larger, including blasted rock, if necessary, will be disposed of in one or more of the following ways to avoid the introduction of rock into the topsoil at the completion of construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buried on the ROW or in approved construction work areas either in the ditchline or as fill during grade cut restoration in accordance with the construction specifications. In managed agricultural lands, wetlands, and residential areas, rock may only be backfilled to the top of the existing bedrock profile;</li> <li>• Windrowed per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Used as a fenceline or all-terrain vehicle (“ATV”) deterrent along property lines as practicable and per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Removed and disposed of at an appropriately approved site; and</li> <li>• Used as riprap for stream bank stabilization where allowed by an applicable regulatory agency (ies).</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, Tennessee will implement the procedures contained in the state-specific ECPs.</p> <p>vvv. Measures to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive species, noxious weeds, and soil pests resulting from construction and restoration activities are discussed in the Invasive Species Management Plans for each state.</p> <p>www. Tennessee will meet this objective by employing the erosion and sedimentation control measures contained in Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and state-specific ECPs.</p> <p>xxx. Tennessee will follow the procedures and measures discussed in the state-specific ECPs.</p>	<p>uuu. RR7, Section 7.5.5            Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N</p> <p>vvv. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 13</p> <p>www. Volume II, Appendix H            Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N</p> <p>xxx. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N</p>	<p>uuu. 7-17            vvv. N/A            www. N/A            xxx. N/A</p>
103	<p>General – Include a detailed discussion on ground heaving and frost heaving and any potential hazards it might pose to the Project. Include areas along the proposed Project where ground heaving may be encountered, frost depths along the proposed pipeline route, and mitigation measures, or pipeline design elements that would be used in locations where ground heaving is a possibility. Include a discussion of ground heaving and frost heaving at aboveground facilities.</p>	<p>Tennessee will comply with DOT depth requirements for the project. The bottom of the pipeline proposed to be installed for the project will be below the typically experienced frost lines in the region. Additionally, Tennessee notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipelines, including those to be installed for the project, are typically bedded in non-frost heave susceptible soils (i.e. soils have low fines content).</li> <li>• Pipelines are constructed with high strength steel with welded joints. This is similar to how steel piers for boat docks are capable of withstanding the forces of ice forming in the water.</li> <li>• Frost is not consistent and occurs in pockets. As such the pipeline would be anchored in the ground by the surrounding soil that does not have the upheaval force of frost.</li> <li>• Pipelines traditionally operate at a temperature warmer than 32 degrees Fahrenheit which prevents frost from forming immediately adjacent to the pipe.</li> </ul>	<p>RR7, Section 7.5.8</p>	<p>7-19</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
104	General – Include a discussion of stony/rocky soils and include this soil limitation along with shallow depth to bedrock in tables 7.1-1, 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.2-1, 7.3-1, and associated summary tables.	Rock material 4 inches in size or larger, including blasted rock, if necessary, will be disposed of in one or more of the following ways to avoid the introduction of rock into the topsoil at the completion of construction activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buried on the ROW or in approved construction work areas either in the ditchline or as fill during grade cut restoration in accordance with the construction specifications. In managed agricultural lands, wetlands, and residential areas, rock may only be backfilled to the top of the existing bedrock profile;</li> <li>• Windrowed per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Used as a fenceline or ATV deterrent along property lines as practicable and per written landowner agreement with Tennessee;</li> <li>• Removed and disposed of at an appropriately approved site; and</li> <li>• Used as riprap for stream bank stabilization where allowed by an applicable regulatory agency (ies).</li> </ul>	RR7, Section 7.5.5 RR7, Attachment 7b	7-17 Attachment 7b
105	Section 7.3 (page 7-5) – Include a summary table of impacts to prime farmlands and farmlands of state wide importance. Include total acres that would be affected by Project construction and operation for active agricultural land, fallow agricultural land/field, managed forest land, and open field/open land.	Tables summarizing impacts to prime farmlands and farmlands of statewide importance based on photo-interpreted land use and field survey data have been provided in Attachment 7b. Data regarding managed forest land and active/fallow agricultural lands has not been identified; this information will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR7, Attachment 7b, Tables 7.4-1a and 7.4-1b	7b-283 to 7b-286
106	Section 7.4.1 (page 7-7) – Include a discussion of the mitigation measures and pipeline design that would be used in the Schoharie Valley, which is known to be commonly flooded, and the Ponemah Bog Sanctuary where burial of the pipeline could disrupt drainage, and acidic conditions could affect the pipeline.	The Project has been re-routed and no longer crosses the Ponemah Bog Sanctuary. However, to prevent compaction and rutting in other areas of hydric soils or where frequent flooding occurs, Tennessee will restrict construction activity to the construction corridor, reduce loads, and when possible, reschedule certain activities during high soil moisture periods or soil saturation. Where necessary, timber mats will be utilized to reduce severe compaction and rutting. Additionally, Tennessee has prepared state-specific Soil Protection and Subsoil Decomaction Mitigation Plans included in the state-specific ECPs.	RR7, Section 7.4.3 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 10	7-9
107	Section 7.5.1 (page 7-11) and Appendix K (page K-72) – This section states that erosion control barriers would be installed immediately after soil disturbance while the state-specific ECP states that erosion control such as silt fence and hay bales would be installed following perimeter brush clearing. Clarify this apparent discrepancy.	Tennessee’s objective is to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation during construction and to effectively restore the ROW and other disturbed areas. Tennessee will meet this objective by employing the erosion and sedimentation control measures contained in Tennessee’s Project-specific Plan and Procedures and state-specific ECPs. Any discrepancy in Resource Report 7 and the ECPs has been corrected.	RR7, Section 7.5.1 Volume II, Appendix H Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N	7-11 to 7-12
108	Section 7.5.2 (page 7-12) – This section states that phase two of soil decompaction involves use of a paratill to loosen the soil profile to a depth of 20 to 22 inches after topsoil replacement. However, section 7.5.3 (page 7-13) states that the top 12 inches of soil would be segregated and kept from mixing with subsoil. Clarify that the actions in phase two of soil decompaction would not mix topsoil with subsoil.	Paratill®, or equivalent machinery, is designed such that it will not mix topsoil and subsoil during decompaction. Tennessee will comply with their Soil Protection and Subsoil Decomaction Mitigation Plan, which is included with the state-specific ECPs.	RR7, Section 7.5.2 RR7, Section 7.5.3 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 10	7-12 to 7-13 7-13 to 7-14
109	Section 7.5.4 (page 7-14) – Specify what measures Tennessee Gas would use to mitigate impacts to agricultural land and prime farmlands and identify under what conditions they would be used.	Mitigation measures for agricultural land and prime farmlands have been included in Resource Report 7. Additionally, Tennessee will comply with their Soil Protection and Subsoil Decomaction Mitigation Plan, which is included with the state-specific ECPs.	RR7, Section 7.5.4 Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N, Attachment 10	7-14 to 7-16



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
110	<p>Attachment 7B Table 7.3-1 (page 7b-284) – Include the following information:</p> <p>yyy. soil limitation ratings for all soil limitations including potential water erosion, potential wind erosion, stony rocky soils, shallow depth to bedrock, potential soil compaction, poor revegetation potential, poor drainage potential, and prime farmlands (including farmlands of statewide importance);</p> <p>zzz. soil limitations ratings for all soils that would be affected by Project construction, not just agricultural and residential areas;</p> <p>aaaa. classify soils as having a poor drainage potential if the drainage potential is listed as poor or worse;</p> <p>bbbb. classify soils as having shallow depth to bedrock if bedrock is at a depth of 5 feet or less from the ground surface;</p> <p>cccc. classify soils as being stony/rocky if 20 percent of the surface layer consists of rock fragments greater than 3 inches;</p> <p>dddd. classify soils as having a poor revegetation potential if soils have a capability class of three or greater, have a low water capacity, or if slopes are greater than 8 percent; and</p> <p>eeee. specify the criteria used to determine the potential of a soil to be eroded by wind and/or water.</p>	<p>yyy. Soil limitations have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p> <p>zzz. As per the FERC <i>Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation</i>, soil limitations have only been included for agricultural and residential areas.</p> <p>aaaa. Soils with poor drainage potential have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p> <p>bbbb. Soils with shallow depth to bedrock have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p> <p>cccc. Stony/rocky soils have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p> <p>dddd. Soils with poor revegetation potential have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p> <p>eeee. Table 7.3-1 includes footnotes defining wind and water erosion criteria.</p>	<p>yyy. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>zzz. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>aaaa. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>bbbb. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>cccc. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>dddd. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p> <p>eeee. RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p>	<p>yyy. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>zzz. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>aaaa. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>bbbb. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>cccc. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>dddd. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p> <p>eeee. 7b-229 to 7b-281</p>
111	<p>Attachment 7B (Table 7.1-1) – Several soil series including but not limited to Holly Soils, Udifluvents, cobbly, and Medisaprists have a revegetation potential listed as N/A. Confirm whether or not the revegetation potential is not applicable for each of these soil series, and, if so, identify why the revegetation potential is not applicable.</p>	<p>Soils with poor revegetation potential (defined as high, moderate, or low) have been identified in Table 7.3-1.</p>	<p>RR7, Attachment 7b, Table 7.3-1</p>	<p>7b-229 to 7b-281</p>
112	<p>Appendix K, State Specific ECPs (General) – Include the mitigation measures and construction techniques that would be used when construction would take place in vulnerable soils such as fragipans (e.g., table 5.6-3).</p>	<p>Tennessee will implement the measures identified in the state-specific ECPs.</p>	<p>Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
<b>Resource Report 8 - Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics</b>				
113	<p>General – Include all information listed in RR 8 as pending or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>ffff. section 8.1.3 (page 8-10) – Include locations, lengths, and any proposed improvements of additional access roads;</p> <p>gggg. section 8.1.4 (page 8-10) – Update contractor yard information once landowner permissions are obtained;</p> <p>hhhh. section 8.1.6.2 (page 8-22 and table 8.1-8) – Include updated information on agricultural drain tile locations;</p> <p>iiii. section 8.2.1 (page 8-33 et seq.) – Include updated correspondence with planning agencies, along with information regarding locations of planned development and mitigation measures;</p> <p>jjjj. section 8.2.2 and Appendix P (page 8-40 et seq.) – Include results of field verifications of building locations and include all site-specific residential construction plans for residences within 50 feet of the construction work area;</p> <p>kkkk. section 8.3 (page 8-47) – Include updated information regarding the location, distance crossed, and affected acreage on all public and recreational lands and special land uses;</p> <p>llll. section 8.3.1 and Section 8.3.2 (page 8-48 et seq.) – Include further correspondence with agency staff regarding public conservation lands and natural, recreational, or scenic areas. Add details regarding existing resources, impacts, and mitigation measures;</p> <p>mmmm. section 8.3.2.1.2 (page 8-88) – Describe methods that would be used to avoid or minimize impacts on the Connecticut River Byway based on consultation with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation;</p>	<p>ffff. Table 8.1-6 has been updated to include information on Access Roads.</p> <p>gggg. Tennessee is currently contact landowners to obtain survey permission. Tennessee will work with landowners to obtain permission to utilize areas as contractor yards and update in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>hhhh. Table 8.1-8 includes updated information on drain tile locations.</p> <p>iiii. Updated correspondence is included in Volume II, Appendix B. Planned development information has been updated. Tennessee is coordinating with planned development landowners/development owners to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to planned developments.</p> <p>jjjj. Residential construction plans are included in Volume II, Appendix P.</p> <p>kkkk. Information on public and recreational lands and special land use has been updated.</p> <p>llll. Correspondence received from agency staff on public conservation and natural, recreational, and scenic areas through October 1, 2015 is included in this ER.</p> <p>mmmm. Tennessee has co-located the Project with an existing utility corridor in this area and will be crossing this byway using the bore construction method to minimize the impacts. Tennessee will consult with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation - Highway Department (“MADOT”) for information on MADOT’s road crossing permit process and coordinate with them regarding crossing of this byway to further avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts on this route.</p>	<p>ffff. RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.1-6</p> <p>gggg. To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>hhhh. RR8, Table 8.1-8</p> <p>iiii. Volume II, Appendix B</p> <p>RR8, Section 8.2.1</p> <p>RR8, Table 8.2-1</p> <p>jjjj. Volume II, Appendix P</p> <p>kkkk. RR8, Section 8.3</p> <p>llll. Volume II, Appendix B</p> <p>mmmm. RR8, Section 8.3.2.1.2</p>	<p>ffff. 8b-111 to 8b-118</p> <p>gggg. N/A</p> <p>hhhh. 8-23 to 8-28</p> <p>iiii. 8-35 to 8-39</p> <p>8-40 to 8-44</p> <p>jjjj. N/A</p> <p>kkkk. 8-49 to 8-134</p> <p>llll. N/A</p> <p>mmmm. 8-107</p>
	<p>nmmn. section 8.3.2.1.3 (page 8-88) – Identify the proposed crossing methods for the Westfield River and assess the land use impacts of this crossing;</p> <p>oooo. section 8.3.2.2.1 (page 8-89) – Include additional methods that would be used to avoid or minimize impacts on the Viaduct Valley Way based on consultation with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation;</p> <p>pppp. section 8.3.2.2.2 (page 8-89) – Include results of consultation with the New York State Department of Transportation and assess impacts as appropriate;</p> <p>qqqq. section 8.3.3 (page 8-91 et seq.) – Include further correspondence with agency staff. Add details regarding existing resources, impacts, and mitigation measures based on communications with staff and any other sources;</p> <p>rrrr. section 8.3.4.1.2 (page 8-101) – Document whether the Project would affect the West Street Cemetery in Plainfield and identify mitigation if applicable;</p> <p>ssss. section 8.3.4.1.3 (page 8-102) – Specify how impacts on the Rindge Smallpox Cemetery would be avoided;</p> <p>tttt. section 8.3.4.2.4 (page 8-104) – Specify how impacts on Birches Academy Charter School would be avoided or minimized;</p>	<p>nmmn. Tennessee is proposing a dry crossing method to cross the Westfield River. Tennessee will continue to coordinate with the National Park Service (“NPS”), Massachusetts Department of Fisheries and Wildlife and other interested parties regarding the proposed crossing.</p> <p>oooo. Tennessee will be crossing this byway using the bore construction method to minimize impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with the Project will be temporary in nature and associated with construction of the pipeline. Tennessee will consult with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (“PennDOT”) for information on PennDOT’s road crossing permit process and coordinate with PennDOT regarding crossing of this SR to further avoid, minimize, or mitigate those impacts on this route. Results of this consultation will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>pppp. Tennessee will consult with the New York State Department of Transportation to confirm the locations of state or National Scenic Byways in the Project area, no locations are currently identified. Results of the consultation will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>qqqq. Updated correspondence is included in Volume II, Appendix B. Conservation Land Programs information has been updated.</p> <p>rrrr. The West Street Cemetery is located more than 600 feet from the centerline of the Project. Tennessee will conduct a cultural survey to assess possible indirect effects and avoid any impacts to this area.</p> <p>ssss. Tennessee will work with the landowner to avoid impacts to this site.</p> <p>tttt. Tennessee will work with the town to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any impacts to the Birches Academy Charter School property.</p>	<p>nmmn. RR8, Section 8.3.2.1.3</p> <p>oooo. RR8, Section 8.3.2.2.1</p> <p>To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>pppp. To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>qqqq. Volume II, Appendix B</p> <p>RR8, Section 8.3.3</p> <p>rrrr. RR8, Section 8.3.4.1.3</p> <p>To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>ssss. RR8, Section 8.3.4.1.4</p> <p>tttt. RR8, Section 8.3.4.2.4</p>	<p>nmmn. 8-107 to 8-108</p> <p>oooo. 8-109</p> <p>pppp. N/A</p> <p>qqqq. 8-111 to 8-120</p> <p>rrrr. 8-121 to 8-122</p> <p>ssss. 8-122</p> <p>tttt. 8-124 to 8-125</p>

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>uuuu. section 8.3.4.3 (page 8-104 to 8-106) – Update discussion with the results of surveys, correspondence, and discussions with state agencies and landowners related to specialty crop, organic, and tree farms. Complete table 8.3-7. Specify how Tennessee Gas would avoid or minimize impacts;</p> <p>vvvv. section 8.3.6 (page 8-106) – Include updated information regarding hazardous wastes obtained from online sources and agencies;</p> <p>www. section 8.4.2.2 (page 8-116) – Include a site-specific analysis of impacts from construction and operation of the meter stations, including the dimensions of new meter stations and their sites;</p> <p>xxxx. section 8.5 (page 8-117) – Include results of consultations with applicable federal and state agencies;</p> <p>yyyy. attachment 8b (Table 8.1-6) – Add information to the “Modification Required” column. Also identify the widths of new roads;</p> <p>zzz. attachment 8b (Table 8.2-2) – Add information to the Line List/Tract and Number Building Type columns;</p> <p>aaaa. attachment 8b (Table 8.3-8) – Provide conclusions for those sites still under evaluation. For those sites where impacts are proposed to be unlikely, explain why they are unlikely and what measures would be implemented should impacts occur; and</p> <p>bbbb. appendix F – Include the updated aerial imagery as noted on the alignment sheets and identify the source of the updated information.</p>	<p>uuuu. Tennessee is continuing to conduct environmental surveys, title searches, and consultation with state agencies and landowners to determine the presence of organic and tree farms. Where landowners are affected by the proposed Project, Tennessee will work with these landowners and any of the regulatory or certifying agencies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts and ensure continued enrollment in applicable programs during construction and operation of the Project. This information will be updated as additional survey access is granted.</p> <p>vvvv. State agencies in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut have been contacted to identify properties within 0.25 mile of the Project previously impacted with oil and/or hazardous materials. Tennessee conducted online and database research to identify, to the extent practicable, properties within 0.25 mile of the Project pipeline, meter stations, and compressor stations previously impacted with oil and/or hazardous materials. The lists of identified sites are presented in Tables 8.3-9 and 8.3-10.</p> <p>www. An assessment of potential visual impacts from construction and operation of meter stations will be provided in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>xxxx. Updated correspondence is included in Volume II, Appendix B.</p> <p>yyyy. Table has been completed.</p> <p>zzz. Table has been updated.</p> <p>aaaa. Table has been updated. However, there are still some sites that are under evaluation. Information will be updated in a supplemental filing.</p> <p>bbbb. Updated Aerial Alignment Sheets are provided.</p>	<p>uuuu. RR8, Section 8.3.4.3 RR8, Table 8.3-8 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>vvvv. RR8, Attachment 8b, Tables 8.3-9 and 8.3-10</p> <p>www. To be provided in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>xxxx. Volume II, Appendix B</p> <p>yyyy. RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.1-6</p> <p>zzz. RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.2-2</p> <p>aaaa. RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.3-9 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing</p> <p>bbbb. Volume II, Appendix F</p>	<p>uuuu. 8-126 to 8-130 8-127 to 8-128 vvvv. 8b-197 to 8b-217 www. N/A xxxx. N/A yyyy. 8b-111 to 8b-118 zzz. 8b-151 to 8b-161 aaaa. 8b-197 to 8b-210 bbbb. N/A</p>
114	Section 8.3.1.1.2 (page 8-54) – Confirm that the Appalachian Trail would be crossed using the bore method or describe how impacts would be mitigated should the open cut method be required.	The Appalachian Trail will be crossed using the open cut construction method. Tennessee has prepared a Trail Crossing Plan as part of the state-specific ECPs.	Volume II, Appendices J, M, and N, Attachment 13 Volume II, Appendices K and L, Attachment 14	N/A
115	Section 8.3.1.1 (page 8-64 and 8-72) – Specify crossing methods for both the Wapack Trail and trails within the Wind Blown Cross Country Ski Area in New Hampshire. Discuss impacts to recreation including whether or not trails would be able to remain open and include methods that would be used to mitigate these impacts.	Tennessee has prepared a General Trail Crossing Plan as part of the state-specific ECPs.	Volume II, Appendices J, M, and N, Attachment 13 Volume II, Appendices J, K, and L, Attachment 14	N/A
116	Section 8.3.2.1.4 (page 8-89) – Identify any Land and Water Conservation Fund properties that would be crossed by the pipeline and describe the impacts and appropriate mitigation based on consultation with the appropriate agencies.	Land and Water Conservation Fund (“LWCF”) properties identified as being crossed by the proposed Project are listed in Table 8.3-5. Tennessee will consult with applicable state and federal agencies, including the NPS, to ensure that construction and operation of the proposed Project complies with the LWCF Act of 1965. Results of the consultations will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.3-5 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	8b-169 to 8b-174
117	Section 8.3.3 (page 8-91) – In addition to the lands enrolled in Federal and State conservation land programs, specify the locations and acreages of all deeded conservation easements that would be crossed by the Project, and describe restrictions in the easements and whether or not the Project will comply with the easements. Discuss how effects would be mitigated if conditions in the easements cannot be met.	Tennessee is currently coordinating with local agencies to determine potential impacts to lands with deeded conservation easements. Tennessee will work with landholders to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, as appropriate, to properties protected under the easements. Results of the coordination will be provided in a supplemental filing.	RR8, Section 8.3.3 RR8, Attachment 8b, Table 8.3-5 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	8-111 to 8-120 8b-169 to 8b-174
118	Section 8.3.5 (page 8-106) – Identify all facilities within the New York coastal zone management area.	Tennessee is proposing the installation of pipeline by HDD under the Hudson River and construction of the HDD entry and exit bore pits adjacent to the river. There are no other facilities within the coastal zone management area.	RR8, Section 8.3.5	8-130

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
119	Section 8.4.1 (page 8-109) – Provide the length of the pipeline route through each of the visually sensitive areas listed in section 8.4.1.1 through 8.4.1.16 and list the acreages affected by duration (e.g., temporary, long term, permanent).	Requested information will be provided in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
120	Section 8.4.1.13 (page 8-113) – Discuss how visual resource impacts would be minimized at waterbody crossing, especially scenic waterbodies such as the Deerfield River whether an HDD is successful or not at this location.	There would be no visual impacts to scenic rivers crossed by HDD, including the Susquehanna River and the Deerfield River. If the HDD at these rivers is unsuccessful, Tennessee will coordinate with the appropriate federal, state, and local permitting authorities to minimize and mitigate potential impacts.	RR8, Section 8.4.1.1 RR8, Section 8.4.1.17	8-135 8-139
121	Section 8.4.2.1 (page 8-114) – Provide a description of the dimensions of the proposed compressor stations and the sites on which they would be located. Describe the visual characteristics and topography of the surrounding area for each site. State whether each compressor station would be visible from public vantage points or from residences and what the impacts would be from locating the compressor station in this area. Describe whether existing terrain or vegetation would screen views. Describe whether additional mitigation measures would be used to reduce the visual impacts by compressor station.	Additional information regarding potential impacts of the proposed compressor stations has been added.	RR8, Section 8.4.2.1	8-142 to 8-146
122	Section 8.4.2.1.4 (page 8-114) – Discuss why the Supply Path Tail Station would result in a change in visual quality. Describe how restoration would successfully mitigate this impact.	Portions of the compressor station will be visible from Terrace Mountain Road with the auxiliary and controls buildings being closest to the road. The compressor building will be located approximately 500 feet from Terrace Mountain Road, and much of the other equipment will be set back from the road to where it will not be visible due to topography and the surrounding wooded properties. Construction and operation of the Supply Path Tail Station is expected to be a noticeable change to the visual quality of the existing landscape as viewed from residences along Terrace Mountain Road. Tennessee will engage in discussions with applicable stakeholders to determine if any mitigation measures to address visual impacts may be required.	RR8, Section 8.4.2.1.4	8-143
123	Section 8.4.2.1.5 (page 8-115) – Correct the number “1,550400,” which appears to be a typo.	Number has been corrected.	RR8, Section 8.4.2.1.5	8-143 to 8-144
<b>Resource Report 9 - Air and Noise Quality</b>				
124	Section 9.1 (page 9.3) – Indicate the horsepower for each proposed compressor turbines, and identify at each new and modified compressor station (manufacturer, model, etc.). In addition, identify all other air-emission producing equipment at the compressor stations.	Details regarding compressor stations are provided in Resource Report 1. Additionally, combustion equipment for each compressor station is provided in Table 9.0-1 in Resource Report 9.	RR1, Section 1.1.2.2.1 RR1, Table 1.1-4 RR9, Table 9.0-1	1-31 to 1-46 1-47 9-1 to 9-2
125	Section 9.1 (page 9.3) – Indicate whether any compressor station is within 62 miles of a federal Class I area, and if so, discuss potential impacts and mitigation.	Proposed new compressor station distances to Class I Areas have been provided in Table 9.2-2.	RR9, Table 9.1-2	9-4 to 9-5
126	Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-18) – Include detailed descriptions of any state or local greenhouse gas emission reduction regulations or initiatives, and how the Project would impact compliance with them.	State-specific permitting and requirements, as well as any potentially applicable greenhouse gas initiatives, have been discussed by state. The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative that affects large fossil fuel power plants in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York is not discussed as the Project is related to natural gas transmission.	RR9, Section 9.1.2.5	9-24 to 9-29

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
127	Section 9.1.2.5 (pages 9-19 to 9-23) – Include a summary of air quality regulations pertaining to construction of the pipeline for all states, or verify that no related provisions would apply to Project construction. For Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut that have maintenance areas in the Project area, include a discussion of provisions that would be applicable within the maintenance area, or verify that no related provisions would apply to the Project.	A summary of air quality regulations pertaining to construction of the pipeline has been provided. There are no such regulations in New Hampshire or Massachusetts.	RR9, Section 9.1.2.5	9-24 to 9-29
128	Section 9.1.3.2 (page 9-25) – Provide the emission rate of criteria pollutants (NOx, CO, SO2, PM10, PM2.5, VOC), greenhouse gases (GHG), and speciated hazardous air pollutants from all the equipment at the proposed compressor stations (engines, turbines, dehydrators, generators, boilers, tanks, fugitive methane emissions, etc.) expressed in tons per year for maximum operating conditions. Include supporting calculations, emission factors, fuel consumption rates, and annual hours of operation.	Emission rates in tons per year have been provided in tables for each new compressor station. Emission calculations are included in Attachment 9b to Resource Report 9. Additional details on the air emission sources for the compressor stations, including the basis for emission rates and calculations, and the dispersion modeling analyses are provided in the air permit applications Attachment 9c.	RR9, Table 9.1-17 RR9, Tables 9.1-20 through 9.1-23 RR9, Tables 9.1-29 through 9.1-31 RR9, Table 9.1-35 RR9, Attachment 9b RR9, Attachment 9c	9-34 9-37 to 9-40 9-48 to 9-50 9-56 Attachment 9b Attachment 9c
129	Section 9.1.3.2 (page 9-25) – For each compressor station, estimate the number of yearly releases, the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and GHG released per blowdown in tons per year, indicate whether the blowdown would be installed with a silencer and estimate the noise impact at the nearest noise sensitive areas (NSA).	Emission rates in tons per year have been provided in tables for each new compressor station.	RR9, Table 9.1-17 RR9, Tables 9.1-20 through 9.1-23 RR9, Tables 9.1-29 through 9.1-31 RR9, Table 9.1-35	9-34 9-37 to 9-40 9-48 to 9-50 9-56
130	Section 9.1.3.2 (page 9-25) – Provide an air quality screening (AERSCREEN) analysis of each compressor station demonstrating that emissions of criteria pollutants do not result in exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), SILs or state standards. Include all input parameters (emission rate, stack height, stack temp, exit velocity, etc.) and justify bases for any assumptions. For any facility requiring refined modeling for an air permit using refined modeling (AERMOD or EPA-approved alternative), provide the impacts for all criteria pollutants (regardless of state permit requirements), modeling protocol, a narrative describing and justifying the modeling basis all inputs (MET data, terrain data), and all input and output files.	An overview of the dispersion modeling analysis and a comparison of the results to significant impact levels ("SILs") and National Ambient Air Quality Standards ("NAAQS") is provided in Resource Report 9. The requested details on the dispersion modeling methodology and inputs are provided in modeling reports provided to the state agencies to support the air permit applications.	RR9, Section 9.1.3 RR9, Attachment 9c	9-30 to 9-65 Attachment 9c
131	Respond to public comments regarding local human health impacts from HAPs and air toxic emissions from the planned compressor stations.	All compressor will be classified as minor sources of hazardous air pollutants ("HAPs") in part due to the use of natural gas fuel use and add on controls on the compressor turbines (i.e., oxidation catalyst). The Project will comply with all state and federal requirements for HAPs/air toxic pollutants and Tennessee will continue to respond to public questions regarding these pollutants.	RR9, Section 9.1.3	9-30 to 9-65
132	Section 9.1.3.2 (page 9-25) – Discuss whether odor from the compressor turbines would be detectable beyond the compressor station site and what methods Tennessee Gas would implement to prevent odor.	No detectable odors from the proposed compressor turbines are expected as confirmed by dispersion modeling that demonstrates that maximum air concentrations for all compressor stations are less than the NAAQS which include primary (protect health) and secondary (protect public welfare including odor) standards.	RR9, Section 9.1.3	9-30 to 9-65
133	Section 9.1.3.3 (page 9-25 to 9-29) – As the construction emissions are very close to the General Conformity Thresholds for specific nonattainment areas, provide a Plan that would ensure emissions would not exceed the applicability threshold. This plan may include issues such as ensuring only newer equipment is used, tracking hours, tracking fuel use, etc.	Revisions and refinements have been made to the construction emissions since the Draft filing where the estimated emission totals had exceeded 90% of the General Conformity thresholds. Based on the revised estimates in the Final submittal, the maximum annual emissions in any non-attainment county or maintenance area is about 80% of the thresholds.	RR9, Section 9.1.3.5	9-59 to 9-60

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
134	134. Section 9.1.4.1 (pages 9-30 and 9-31) – Include specific details on: ccccc. how Tennessee Gas would ensure that contractors and employees minimize vehicle and equipment idling time; ddddd. what maximum speeds would be on unpaved roads; and eeeee. how Tennessee Gas would determine when application of water is warranted to control dust in active construction zones.	cccc. Measures to ensure that contractors and employees minimize vehicle and equipment idling time will be provided in the Implementation Plan that will be prepared prior to construction. dddd. Allowable maximum speeds on unpaved roads will be provided in the Implementation Plan that will be prepared prior to construction. eeee. The control of fugitive dust control and mitigation measures during construction are provided in Tennessee’s Project-specific Environmental Construction Plans for each state. The ECPs for each state will be implemented during installation of the pipeline segments.	cccc. To be provided in the Implementation Plan dddd. To be provided in the Implementation Plan eeee. Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N	cccc. N/A dddd. N/A eeee. N/A
135	Section 9.1.4.2 (page 9-30) – Include a discussion on the potential to generate crystalline silica as fugitive dust from granite excavation and how Tennessee Gas would monitor and control such dust.	Any potential silica emissions would be in the form of fugitive dust temporarily generated during construction activities. Measures to mitigate and control fugitive dust are outlined in the state-specific ECPs.	Volume II, Appendices J, K, L, M, and N	N/A
136	Section 9.2.1.2 (pages 9-32 to 9-35) – Identify the local and state nuisance-based noise ordinances and vibration ordinances for all areas in which a pipeline or compressor station would be located, and indicate how Tennessee Gas would address each one during both construction and operations.	Local and state nuisance-based noise ordinances and vibration ordinances for all areas in which a pipeline or compressor station would be located have been provided. Many townships have nuisance-based noise provisions that do not contain numeric noise criteria. The FERC noise criterion will be applicable in those cases.	RR9, Section 9.2.1.2	9-72 to 9-76
137	Section 9.2.2 (pages 9-36 to 9-50) – Ensure that the acoustical analysis for the compressor stations includes: ffff. step-by-step supporting calculations or identification of the computer program used to model the noise levels, the input and raw output data, far-field sound level data for maximum facility operation, the source of the data, and all assumptions in running the model; and gggg. sound pressure levels all noise generating equipment, and for un-muffled engine inlets and exhausts, engine casings, and cooling equipment, dynamic insertion loss for all mufflers, sound transmission loss for all compressor station building components (including walls, roof, doors, windows and ventilation openings), sound attenuation from the station to the nearest NSA, the manufacturer’s name, the model number, the performance rating, and a description of each noise source and noise control component. hhhh. Topographic maps identifying the location of the NSAs in relation to the compressor station.	Acoustical Assessment Reports with the requested information are included for each compressor station site as attachments to Resource Report 9. Manufacturer’s name and model number will be determined during detailed design and procurement. Noise sensitive area (“NSA”) distances and directions in relation to the compressor stations are provided on the Figures in Attachment 9a.	RR9, Attachments 9d through 9n RR9, Attachment 9a, Figures 9.2-1 through 9.2-10	Attachments 9d through 9n Attachment 9a
138	Section 9.2.2 (pages 9-36 to 9-50) – Include a discussion on what measures Tennessee Gas would implement to ensure that vibration impacts would not result in a perceptible increase in vibration.	A perceptible increase in vibration is extremely unlikely due to operational compressor station and meter and regulation station equipment. Through proper equipment design, balancing, and maintenance, vibrations that could be severe enough to be perceptible outside facility boundaries are avoided, as they could likely damage operational equipment.	N/A	N/A
139	Section 9.2.2.1 (page 9-35) – For the noise survey conducted on December 8 and 9, 2014 at the NSAs near Station 319, provide time of day, weather conditions, wind speed and direction, and other noise sources. Provide copies of the original contractor noise survey reports.	Requested information is provided in the Acoustical Assessment Report for Station 319.	RR9, Attachment 9d	Attachment 9d
140	Section 9.2.5 (page 80) – Identify whether HDD activities would occur on a 24-hour basis, and the approximate time required for each drill (days/weeks).	Tennessee is planning on conducting HDD activities during daytime working hours, expect for pullback activities which may require 24-hour operations for a short timeframe. The drill times vary depending on length of drill, existing geology, and other factors. Currently, estimates for HDD operations range from 4 to 26 weeks (average of 17 weeks). A baseline noise survey will be conducted at each entry and exit site to determine NSAs and the existing sound levels at each NSA.	RR9, Section 9.2.5	9-100

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
141	Section 9.2.5 (page 9-80) – Include specific details on what measures Tennessee Gas would implement to mitigate HDD noise. State that effort would be made to mitigate noise prior to offering relocation.	An acoustical analysis will be performed to determine the estimated HDD noise contribution at each NSA for all entry and exit sites. Noise mitigation requirements will be determined during the analysis to determine how each HDD site will meet regulatory requirements.	RR9, Section 9.2.5	9-100
142	Section 9.2.5 (page 9-80) – Include a section on blasting noise.	A section on blasting noise has been included.	RR9, Section 9.2.4.4	9-100
143	Section 9.2.6 (page 9-82) – Include a description of the frequency of anticipated blowdown events by type of blowdown (maintenance, capped, full-station, etc.) as well as the likelihood of an unscheduled pipeline blowdown event. This discussion should include the cause and frequency of a blowdown event, associated noise and emissions, and the approximate time it would take to evacuate gas from the pipeline.	Venting is an infrequent event at compressor stations during which small amounts of natural gas are emitted in the following operational conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit shutdown: When a compressor unit is shut down and remains shut down for an extended period (greater than 24 hours), the natural gas stored inside a small amount of piping (from the unit valves to the compressor) is vented. This is done to protect the integrity of the compressor.</li> <li>• Unit startup: If the unit has been down for an extended period, the compressor piping will need to be purged and pressurized during startup. During this process, the piping between the unit suction valve and unit discharge valve is briefly purged with gas for one to two minutes. This is to make sure that all air is purged from this piping.</li> <li>• Emergency shut downs: Emergency shutdowns (“ESD”) are extremely rare events and are initiated by gas or fire detection systems or manually initiated by an employee. When a station ESD is initiated, all gas in the station yard is vented to the atmosphere. Regulations require that the gas be vented to 50 psig within 3.5 minutes.</li> </ul>	RR9, Section 9.2.6	9-100 to 9-101
144	Section 9.3 (page 9-82) – Provide a discussion on climate change.	A discussion on climate change has been included in the discussion of GHGs.	RR9, Section 9.1.2.4	9-23 to 9-24
<b>Resource Report 10 - Alternatives</b>				
145	General – Include all information listed in RR 10 (or in the Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports matrix) listed as pending, “will be addressed in the final ER,” or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to: iiiii. additional data categories in all alternatives comparison tables for miles or feet of expected side-slope construction (including data for both moderate and severe side slope), shallow bedrock, karst geology, landslides, numbers of landowners affected, residences located within 125 and 250 feet of any proposed work area, miles/acres of interior forest, streams with drinking water use designation, important bird areas, and Audubon forest blocks of importance; jjjjj. a list of the “other shippers” mentioned in Section 10.1; kkkk a detailed comparative analyses specifically assessing viable alternative crossing locations (i.e., viable for the proposed route) for the Appalachian Trail to minimize visual, usage interruption, and other potential impacts. Discuss and document coordination with the National Park Service and other relevant stakeholders regarding the proposed Trail crossing and alternatives;	General - All info identified as TBD has been updated. iiiii. The tables have been updated with information requested in DR2. Streams with drinking water designation, Important Bird Areas, and Audubon forest blocks of importance are included in all tables. The other categories requested here are not included as they were not previously requested. jjjjj. Negotiations continue with additional Project Shippers for both the Supply Path and Market Path Components of the Project. Information regarding the “other shippers” will be provided in a supplemental filing. kkkk A new section, 10.3.4, was added to discuss alternate crossing locations of the Trail. Consultations were conducted with the Massachusetts Appalachian Trail Committee. A trail-crossing plan is included in the ECPs.	iiii. RR10, Section 10.3 jjjjj. RR10, Section 10.1 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing kkkk. RR10, Section 10.3.4 Volume II, Appendices J, M, and N, Attachment 13 Volume II, Appendices K and L, Attachment 14	iiii. 10-22 to 10-100 jjjjj. 10-1 to 10-3 kkkk. 10-99 to 10-100

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
	<p>lllll. a discussion regarding the feasibility of using waste heat electric generation (cogeneration) for the proposed turbines at the proposed compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity potentially generated on a kilowatt/month basis and compare this with the amount of electricity used by the compressor station(s) per month. Describe the average load factor of the facility and any impediments that would prevent the operation of the compressor station continuously at 60 percent minimum load. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required under a cogeneration system with return to the electric grid;</p> <p>mmmmm. a discussion of the feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed new compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity required and the number of electric motors required. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required for the electric motors. Demonstrate why this is not feasible in areas where the planned compressor stations would be along an electric transmission powerline;</p> <p>nnnnn. a comparative alternatives analysis for all of the other (non-compressor station) permanent, aboveground facilities such as meter stations and MLVs where appropriate, such as where there could be visual or noise impacts to sensitive receptors; and</p> <p>ooooo. additional analyses for the Existing Line 200 Alternative combined with the New York Alternative as well as the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative combined with the New York Alternative. Indicate the number of miles of looping, and additional compression that would be required to handle the current 1.3 bcf proposed.</p>	<p>lllll. A discussion regarding the feasibility of using waste heat electric generation (cogeneration) for the proposed turbines at the proposed compressor stations has been provided.</p> <p>mmmmm. The feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed new compressor stations has been provided.</p> <p>nnnnn. An alternatives comparative analysis was not conducted for MLVs and meter stations. Tennessee complied with DOT requirements for these types of facilities and chose the best available site within the allowable area as per DOT requirements.</p> <p>ooooo. Additional analysis, including miles of looping and information regarding additional compression, has been provided.</p>	<p>lllll. RR10, Section 10.5.3                      mmmmm. RR10, Section 10.5.3                      nnnnn. RR10, Section 10.6                      ooooo. RR10, Sections 10.3.1.2.7 and 10.3.1.2.8</p>	<p>lllll. 10-109 to 10-113                      mmmmm. 10-109 to 10-113                      nnnnn. 10-113 to 10-115                      ooooo. 10-55 to 10-63</p>
2	<p>Include a description of cumulative and/or overlapping impacts these projects and the planned NED Project would have on each environmental resource. Also include descriptions of the measures that would be implemented to minimize these impacts. Lastly, include a map showing the identified projects in relation to the planned NED Project. In addition, this cumulative discussion should include any available information on regional predictive climate change effects and the resultant cumulative impact on resources and on the planned NED Project.</p>	<p>The cumulative impact of the projects are discussed in detail in each of the applicable Resource Reports.</p>	<p>RR1, Section 1.9                      RR2, Section 2.4                      RR3, Section 3.5                      RR4, Section 4.6                      RR5, Section 5.11                      RR6, Section 6.7                      RR7, Section 7.6                      RR8, Section 8.6                      RR9, Section 9.1.5                      RR9, Section 9.2.7</p>	<p>1-153 to 1-162                      2-94 to 2-157                      3-118 to 3-126                      4-142 to 4-144                      5-29 to 5-36                      6-99 to 6-102                      7-19 to 7-21                      8-147 to 8-183                      9-68 to 9-70                      9-101 to 9-102</p>
146	<p>Section 10.2 (page 10-9) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 EIR, provide a table of all of the pipeline systems reviewed in Section 10.2, including both existing (such as Tennessee 200 and 300, Millennium, Transco Leidy, Iroquois, Algonquin, M&amp;NP/PNGTS Joint, Granite State, and M&amp;NP) and proposed systems. Consider whether pipeline segments or facilities from different system alternatives could be combined into viable hybrid system alternatives.</p>	<p>Table 10.2-1 includes all of the proposed pipeline systems reviewed in Section 10.2, but does not include existing systems. Tennessee does not have access to proprietary information concerning the flow characteristics of the existing interstate pipeline systems in the Pennsylvania, New York, and New England areas where the Project is proposed. However, based on publicly available information from open season notices and filings submitted to the Commission, as well as through access to other publically available sources, Tennessee believes that these existing pipeline systems are at or near capacity.</p>	<p>RR10, Section 10.2.2                      RR10, Table 10.2-1</p>	<p>10-13 to 10-22                      10-20</p>



Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
147	Section 10.2 (page 10-10) – As requested in our May 15, 2015 EIR, include an evaluation of the facilities, equipment, and processes that would be required to transport a Project-equivalent volume of natural gas from the supply area to the destination locations via the alternative mode of railway. Provide this analysis, as well as the similar analysis completed for truck delivery included only in the Response to Comments matrix, within RR 10 as well.	<p>In order to transport the Project-equivalent volume of 1.3 Bcf/d from the supply area to the destination locations, a daily total of 7,831 truckloads of compressed natural gas (“CNG”) would be required. This would be based on each CNG jumbo tube trailer holding 166 thousand cubic feet (“Mcf”) of gas at 3,000 psig. Loading, transporting, and delivering the CNG from the supply area to the destination would not be physically possible due to the number of trucks required (approximately 4,000 making two trips per day), the distance between the supply area and the delivery destinations, and the time required to load (2 hours minimum) each trailer since all 4,000 trailers would not be able to instantly deliver its load once arrived at a delivery point.</p> <p>Currently, liquefied natural gas (“LNG”) is prohibited from rail transport as a cargo in tank cars. Recently, the Alaska Railroad Corporation (“ARRC”) received approval of its November 2014 request to transport LNG in Independent System Operator (“ISO”)-certified tankers atop flatcars. In order to transport LNG via rail car, a liquefaction facility with rail car loading facilities would be needed near the well field. There are no current or planned liquefaction facilities in the production area. Additionally, since the pipeline does not deliver all of the gas to one location, several gasification locations would be needed at the rail car unloading facilities. Therefore, transport of a Project-equivalent volume of natural gas from the supply area to the destination locations via railway is not a feasible alternative.</p>	RR10, Section 10.2.2.4	10-21 to 10-22
148	Section 10.2.2 (page 10-14) – Tennessee Gas states that the Constitution Pipeline Project currently has shippers that have subscribed for 650,000 dekatherms per day (Dth/d). Tennessee Gas states that it anticipates that this transportation capacity may be increased to an additional 650,000 Dth/d, resulting in an estimated maximum transportation capacity of 1,300,000 Dth/d. However, the Constitution Pipeline Project Final EIS, states that the estimated maximum transportation capacity would be 850,000 Dth/d based on information provided by Constitution. Revise the associated discussion based on this data for maximum transportation capacity for the Constitution Pipeline Project.	Based on the certificate issued by the Commission in the Constitution Order issued for the Constitution Pipeline Project, Tennessee understands that the Commission authorized the construction of a 30-inch, 1,440 pounds per square inch gauge (“psig”) pipeline as part of the Constitution Pipeline Project and that shippers have subscribed for 650,000 dekatherms per day (“Dth/d”) of transportation capacity on that project. In the Constitution Pipeline Project Final Environmental Impact Statement, Constitution estimated that the maximum capacity of its 30-inch line to be only 850,000 Dth/d – which only leaves an expansion of 200,000 Dth/d. In order to deliver gas to the Constitution Pipeline Project facilities, in addition to the compression that Tennessee assumes will need to be added by Constitution, Tennessee also will still need to construct approximately 16 miles of pipeline from its 300 Line in Pennsylvania to the southern portion of the Constitution system, and install compression and metering at that interconnect location. In any event, Tennessee anticipates that more transportation capacity is required for the Project than what the Constitution system will economically provide without looping of that system.	RR10, Section 10.2.2	10-13 to 10-22
149	Section 10.3 (page 10-18) – Evaluate and provide updated, comprehensive analyses of any reasonable system, major route, or minor route alternatives that was suggested by the public or agencies, as well as the feasibility of those alternatives. List and describe the rationale for any of these alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and dismissed without evaluation.	Table 10.3-16 (landowner requested route deviations) and Table 10.3-17 (Agency-requested route deviations) have been updated (as of 9/4/2015).	RR10, Tables 10.3-16 and 10.3-17	10-87 to 10-98

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
150	Section 10.3 (page 10-18) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 EIR, evaluate the constructability of the proposed NED route where it would be co-located with existing pipelines in steep terrain and where the most suitable location for construction may already be encumbered, thereby potentially precluding co-location. Identify any such specific areas where co-location would not be possible. Further, identify and describe any other potential constraints associated with co-location with other pipelines or electrical transmission lines including side slopes, urbanized areas, or other factors. Where the Project would be co-located, overlapping, and/or abutting with existing rights-of-way, indicate where (and for what distance) deviations away from the individual existing rights-of-way would be required due to the avoidance of constraints. As applicable, discuss how the avoidance of constraints could affect the reported co-location data.	Tennessee is currently evaluating the constructability of the proposed NED route where it would be co-located with existing pipelines in steep terrain and will provide the results of the evaluation in a supplemental filing.	To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	N/A
151	Section 10.3.1.1 (page 10-20) – In May 2015, Constitution filed numerous proposed modifications to its routes with its implementation plan. Clarify whether NED has incorporated, is incorporating, or is researching these proposed modifications regarding its proposed route and identify any associated environmental, engineering, landowner, or other constraints that may be associated with NED's general co-location with the Constitution Pipeline project.	Tennessee has reviewed Constitution's updated alignment and is evaluating necessary routing changes in order to maintain and maximize co-location while minimizing environmental and landowner impacts.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.1.1	10-24 to 10-30
152	Section 10.3.1.1.4 (page 10-28) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 EIR, where the proposed route deviates significantly away (at least 0.5 mile) from the original Northeast Exchange Alternative for at least 1 mile, provide detailed mapping as well as a tabular analysis and comparison of the two routes with particular emphasis regarding the avoidance of potential constraints associated with co-location with the Constitution Pipeline.	Both routes are categorized as viable options with the Northeast Exchange ("NEEX") option actually resulting in slightly less mileage than co-locating with Constitution. The NEEX route, however, exposed the pipeline to a difficult crossing that could potential result in an HDD. This location, Fox Creek, could be avoided by co-locating with Constitution. Also by co-locating with Constitution, impacts were minimized through the use of an existing ROW as opposed to creating a greenfield route with the NEEX path.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.1.4	10-37
153	Section 10.3.2 (page 10-32) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 EIR, update RR 10 to include at least one alternative for each segment of the proposed Project, such as the Peabody Lateral as well as the Concord Delivery Line and Maritimes Delivery Line (outside of alternatives presented within and as part of the Wheeler Road alternatives as appropriate).	The Concord Delivery Line is no longer part of the project. Additional language about the Peabody Lateral and Maritimes Delivery Line has been added. An alternative for the Peabody Lateral is currently being evaluated and will be provided in a supplemental filing. Tennessee did not design and analyze an alternative route for the proposed Maritimes Delivery Line due to the short length of the lateral and the design criteria co-located with the Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment.	RR10, Section 10.3.2 To be updated in a Supplemental Filing	10-66
154	Section 10.3.1.10 (page 10-52) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 and May 15, 2015 EIRs, provide comparison tables that include the number of subject properties crossed as well as the total crossing length(s) for the Article 97 Avoidance and Co-location Route Alternatives, list and describe the subject properties in RR 10, and depict the subject locations in mapping as well. Clarify why in figure 10.3-12 (and in the text in section 10.3.1.10) these two alternatives do not appear to be connected to the proposed route at their western terminus instead of potentially connecting with the proposed route near MP 13. Describe the pending potential impact avoidance (such as HDD), minimization, and mitigation measures that could be used to address impacts to Article 97 properties. Report and document the status of Tennessee's ongoing consultations with the Massachusetts agencies regarding possible mitigation.	Article 97 Avoidance and Co-location Alternatives have been discussed and a figure has been provided. Tennessee has and continues to coordinate with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the "MADCR and has engaged with key state agencies including Massachusetts Energy and Environmental Affairs Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, and Department of Agricultural Resources regarding the Project and alternative routing to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to Article 97 properties. As requested by these agencies, Tennessee has identified areas where it can utilize existing ROWs and/or co-locations with linear corridors as part of the routing of the Project pipeline.	RR10, Section 10.3.1.2.9 RR10, Attachment 10a, Figure 10.3-13	10-63 to 10-65 Attachment 10a

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
155	Section 10.3.3 (page 10-57) – Provide updated, comprehensive tables 10.3-14 and 10.3-15 containing all stakeholder-, landowner-, and agency-requested minor route deviations. In addition, address any stakeholder comments where a minor route deviation may not be specifically requested, but where a specific resource concern (e.g., Project proximity to a home, well, spring, wetland, future residential development, etc.) is identified that would potentially benefit from a resource avoidance/impact minimization analysis by Tennessee Gas. Clarify why the two above-referenced tables contain a total of 77 assessments, but Tennessee Gas reported that they had examined over 100 minor route deviations. Evaluate and consider routing, workspace, and construction method alternatives as appropriate. Confirm that the analyses were based on direct stakeholder discussions and on-site evaluations, if the landowner was willing, and on available desktop imagery and data if landowner access was denied. Provide additional data columns for individual tract/parcel number (i.e., matching LL numbers from the list of affected landowners) and also indicating whether the stakeholder's specific concerns have been fully resolved. If the requested reroute was rejected or if the stakeholder's concerns have not been fully resolved, then provide a clear and complete explanation. Clarify the statement "not adopted due to co-location with powerline." Update the status for all deviations listed as "pending" in the July 24, 2015 filing. Confirm that Tennessee Gas will provide regular updates of this table as appropriate throughout the course of the project.	Table 10.3-16 (landowner requested route deviations) and Table 10.3-17 (Agency-requested route deviations) have been updated (as of 9/4/2015).	RR10, Tables 10.3-16 and 10.3-17	10-87 to 10-98
156	Section 10.3.2.4 (page 10-61) – Provide the purpose and context for the Amherst, New Hampshire alternative routes. Indicate whether Tennessee Gas has finalized its pending decision regarding the possible adoption of Amherst alternative route 1 and provide the rationale for the decision.	The Amherst Alternatives were evaluated based on Landowner input and meetings and discussions with the Town of Amherst. The proposed route has been revised since the July filing. The new route was selected upon multiple meetings and discussions with agencies and landowners and avoids an Amherst Public School, Amherst Christian Church, and multiple residential neighborhoods.	RR10, Section 10.3.2.5	10-80 to 10-84
157	Section 10.3.2.5 (page 10-66) – Provide data comparison tables for all alternatives discussed, such as for the Wheeler Road alternatives.	Tables are provided for all alternatives. The Proposed Route no longer traverses the landowners property that drove the Wheeler Road alternative. Therefore, the Alternatives discussed in July are no longer applicable and are not evaluated further.	RR10, Section 10.3	10-22 to 10-100
158	Section 10.3.3.2 (page 10-67) – As requested in our February 27, 2015 EIR, provide documentation of consultation with Massachusetts agencies to identify and evaluate agency requested minor route deviations for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and provide alternatives comparison tables. List and describe (including locations by MP and crossing lengths) the ACECs in RR 10, and depict them in mapping as well.	At the request of FERC, the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts have been included on the applicable Figures in Attachment 10a.	RR10, Section 10.3.3.2 RR10, Table 10.3-17 RR10, Attachment 10a	10-86 10-93 to 10-98 Attachment 10a
159	Section 10.4 (page 10-76) – The Constitution Pipeline Project has not yet begun construction. Evaluate the feasibility of a single pipeline alternative combining the NED project with the Constitution Pipeline project for the Supply Path Component, including under a theoretical scenario where initiation of construction of the Constitution Pipeline could be delayed until the fourth quarter of 2016 or the first quarter of 2017.	The feasibility of a single pipeline alternative combining the NED project with the Constitution Pipeline project for the Supply Path Component has been evaluated.	RR10, Section 10.2.2.2	10-15 to 10-16

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
160	Section 10.7 (page 10-83) – Provide a detailed description, mapping, and comparative tabular analysis of at least one fully viable alternative for each compressor station site. Viability status would include at a minimum a potentially willing seller, the fulfillment of basic site requirements such as size, shape, topography, and existing use, road/utility access, and a minimal distance to the proposed route. Potential alternative sites summarily dismissed due to a lack of survey permission, inadequate size, and the lack of an existing agreement between the landowner and Tennessee Gas regarding the proposed site, for example, are not sufficient avoid a robust alternatives analysis. Provide an alternatives environmental data comparison table for each viable potential site that includes at a minimum: parcel size, areal extent of construction, areal extent of operation, land use setting, zoning, prime farmland, protected species, cultural resources, wetlands, waterbodies, floodplains, noise sensitive areas (number, distance, and location/orientation), visibility, and any local air quality concerns.	Compressor station alternatives are have been discussed. Tables identifying Alternative sites and their reasons for dismissal are included. An alternatives environmental data comparison table for each viable potential site will be prepared and submitted in a supplemental filing.	RR10, Section 10.5 To be provided in a Supplemental Filing	10-101 to 10-113
<b>Resource Report 11 - Reliability and Safety</b>				
161	General – Include all information listed in RR 11 (or in the Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports matrix) listed as pending, “will be addressed in the final ER,” or “TBD” (or include a schedule for submittal), which includes, but is not necessarily limited to the pending data regarding the location of high consequence areas.	All information listed as TBD has been addressed.	RR11	RR11
162	Section 11.2.2 (page 11-6) – Clarify whether the natural gas in the Supply Path pipeline segment from Pennsylvania to the Supply Path Tail Station would be odorized and if not, describe why. Confirm whether or not the only other Project pipeline components that would not be odorized would be the Loop 317-3 and Loop 319-3.	The gas in Loops 317-2 and 319-3 and the 126 miles from Segment C milepost (“MP”) 0.0 to the Supply Path Tail Station will not be odorized. The natural gas transported by Tennessee’s existing 200 Line is currently odorized at Station 245. New odorization facilities will be installed at the Supply Path Mid Station on the Pennsylvania to Wright Pipeline Segment (New York Portion) Segment D, MP 37.25, in Delaware County, New York. The approximately 74.73 miles of pipeline between Pennsylvania to Wright Pipeline Segment (Pennsylvania Portion) Segment C, MP 0.00 and the Supply Path Mid Station will also not be odorized. The segment is not required to be odorized under the requirements of Section 192.624, 49 CFR § 192.625. Natural gas being transported through the following facilities will be odorized: (1) the approximately 57.82 miles of pipeline between the Supply Path Mid Station and Wright in New York; (2) the approximately 187.78 miles of pipeline between Wright, New York, and Dracut, Massachusetts; and (3) the Maritimes Delivery Line, Lynnfield Lateral, Peabody Lateral, Haverhill Lateral, Fitchburg Lateral Extension, and 300 Line CT Loop will each be odorized.	RR11, Section 11.2.2	11-8 to 11-9
163	Provide additional information on Tennessee Gas’s plans to train 1st responders and fire personnel regarding pipeline or aboveground facility incidents.	Additional information regarding training of first responders has been added.	RR11, Section 11.2.9	11-13 to 11-14
164	Indicate if Tennessee Gas would voluntarily build the pipeline to more stringent US DOT Class locations in Class I and Class II areas and/or reduce the distance between mainline valve locations.	Section 192.5 of the USDOT regulations, 49 CFR § 192.5, defines pipeline Class locations based on population density in the vicinity of a pipeline. Valve spacing is determined by many factors, but minimum spacing is defined in the USDOT regulations, 49 CFR Part 192. Tennessee will comply with the USDOT regulations.	RR11, Section 11.2.1	11-3 to 11-8

Comment ID	Comment	Response	Report Section	Resource Report Page Number
165	Indicate the sensitivity of the leak detection equipment that would be installed for the pipeline system.	Tennessee performs leak detection surveys on its pipeline systems in accordance with USDOT 49 CFR 192.706. Surveys are described further in Resource Report 1 of this Environmental Report. Tennessee's operation and maintenance program includes corrosion control, leak inspection surveys, and regularly scheduled aerial and ground patrols of the pipeline ROW. Tennessee does not have leak detection equipment.	RR11, Section 11.2.5 RR11, Section 11.2.8 RR1, Section 1.4.1	11-10 to 11-12 11-13 1-118 to 1-119
166	Indicate the feasibility of recapturing gas from unit blowdowns/blowoffs.	Each MLV for the Project's pipeline facilities will contain a means to vent, or blowdown, the contents of the pipeline to decrease the internal pressure of the pipeline in an emergency situation or for maintenance activities. These venting facilities will typically consist of vertical riser piping on each side of the main line valve, containing manually operated vent valves. Prior to vents, Tennessee typically significantly reduces pressure of the gas in the associated pipeline sections, thereby reducing the amount of gas that is vented. In some instances, at compressor stations, it is possible to recapture some natural gas instead of venting it, and subsequently using it as fuel for compressor engines. Tennessee is considering the feasibility of incorporating this technology into the Project's compressor stations. At locations where the MLVs are adjacent to a powerline, design considerations will dictate the placement and offset of blowdown facilities associated with the MLVs. Each of the newly installed MLVs will be capable of being locally or remotely controlled to isolate the valve section should an abnormal operating condition be detected by local operations personnel or by the Tennessee gas control center, but are not currently designed with auto-close devices. Auto close devices have the potential to close without human intervention, inadvertently disrupting the flow of the pipeline.	RR11, Section 11.2.1	11-7 to 11-8

This page intentionally left blank

**Attachment a**  
**Detailed Construction Schedule**

This page intentionally left blank



## Attachment a

## Pipeline

SPREAD	STATE	O.D.	COMPONENT	TYPE	DESCRIPTION	MILEAGE	CONSTRUCTION	
							START	FINISH
1	PA	36"	Supply	Mainline	Loops 317-3 & 319-3	40.94	2017	2018
2	PA	30"	Supply	Mainline	Mainline to PA/NY Border	37.48	2017	2018
3	NY	30"	Supply	Mainline	PA/NY Border to Supply Mid CS	37.10	2017	2018
4	NY	30"	Supply	Mainline	Supply Mid CS to Wright CS	58.00	2017	2018
5	NY	30"	Market	Mainline	Wright CS to Mid-Market 1 CS	40.30	2017	2018
6	NY/MA	30"	Market	Mainline	MM1 to MM2	NY – 13.12; MA – 17.40	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	MM2 to MM3	39.20	2017	2018
8	MA/NH	30"	Market	Mainline	MM3 to MM4	MA – 4.30; NH – 34.61	2017	2018
9	NH/MA	30"	Market	Mainline	MM3 to Dracut CS	NH – 36.02; MA – 2.82	2017	2018
10	MA	30"	Market	Lateral	Maritime Delivery	0.75	2017	2018
	MA	24"	Market	Lateral	Lynnfield	14.28	2017	2018
	MA	24"	Market	Lateral	Peabody	5.33	2017	2018
	MA/NH	20"	Market	Lateral	Haverhill	MA - 7.25; NH – 2.02	2017	2018
11	NH/MA	20"	Market	Lateral	Fitchburg	NH – 5.08; MA – 8.89	2017	2018
12	CT	24"	Market	Lateral	300 Line CT Loop	14.83	2019	2019

## HDD's

SPREAD	STATE	O.D.	COMPONENT	TYPE	DESCRIPTION	Length	CONSTRUCTION	
							START	FINISH
1	PA	36"	Supply	Mainline	Susquehanna River	3500	2017	2018
3	NY	30"	Supply	Mainline	Ouleout Creek	3100	2017	2018
4	NY	30"	Supply	Mainline	Schoharie Creek	4500	2017	2018
5	NY	30"	Market	Mainline	Hudson River	4500	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	Deerfield River	4500	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	I-91 / Deerfield River	3600	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	CT River	3800	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	Boston & Maine RR	1900	2017	2018
7	MA	30"	Market	Mainline	Millers River	3700	2017	2018
9	NH	30"	Market	Mainline	Merrimack River	2900	2017	2018
10	MA	24"	Market	Lateral	Merrimack River	3300	2017	2018
10	MA	24"	Market	Lateral	Shawsheen River	1900	2017	2018
10	MA	20"	Market	Lateral	I-93	1600	2017	2018
11	NH	12"	Market	Lateral	Fitchburg Endpoint	750	2017	2018
12	CT	24"	Market	Lateral	Farmington River	1600	2019	2019

## Compression

	CITY	STATE	COMPONENT	Type	DESCRIPTION	HP	CONSTRUCTION	
							START	FINISH
1	Wyalusing	PA	Supply	Mainline	Upgrade	Pipe Only	2017	2018
2	New Milford	PA	Supply	Mainline	Head Station	52,500	2017	2018
3	Franklin	NY	Supply	Mainline	Mid Station	50,500	2017	2018
4	Schoharie	NY	Supply	Mainline	Tail Station	50,500	2017	2018
5	Schoharie	NY	Market	Mainline	Head Station	20,600	2017	2018
6	Nassau	NY	Market	Mainline	Mid Market 1	41,000	2017	2018
7	Windsor	MA	Market	Mainline	Mid Market 2	41,000	2017	2018
8	Northfield	MA	Market	Mainline	Mid Market 3	41,000	2017	2018
9	New Ipswich	NH	Market	Mainline	Mid Market 4	41,000	2017	2018
10	Dracut	MA	Market	Mainline	Tail Station	23,000	2017	2018

Attachment a

Meter Stations

	COUNTY	STATE	COMPONENT	TYPE	DESCRIPTION	DESCRIPTION	CONSTRUCTION	
							DESCRIPTION	DESCRIPTION
1	Schoharie	NY	Supply	NY	IGT Bi-Directional	New	2017	2017
2	Schoharie	NY	Supply	NY	NED Check	New	2017	2017
3	Schoharie	NY	Market	NY	200 Line Bi-Di./OPP/Check	New	2017	2017
4	Berkshire	MA	Market	MA	North Adams Check	New	2017	2017
5	Berkshire	MA	Market	MA	North Adams Custody	New	2017	2017
6	Franklin	MA	Market	MA	West Greenfield	New	2017	2017
7	Worcester	MA	Market	MA	Southbridge	Upgrade	2018	2018
8	Worcester	MA	Market	MA	Spencer	Upgrade	2018	2018
9	Worcester	MA	Market	MA	Lunenburg	Upgrade	2018	2018
10	Worcester	MA	Market	MA	Fitchburg Lateral Check	New	2018	2018
11	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Lexington	Upgrade	2018	2018
12	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Burlington	Upgrade	2017	2017
13	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Arlington	Upgrade	2017	2017
14	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Reading	Upgrade	2017	2017
15	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Everett	New	2017	2017
16	Essex	MA	Market	MA	200-1 Check	New	2017	2017
17	Essex	MA	Market	MA	Essex	Upgrade	2017	2017
18	Essex	MA	Market	MA	Lawrence	Upgrade	2018	2018
19	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Haverhill Check	New	2018	2018
20	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Maritimes	New	2018	2018
21	Rockingham	NH	Market	NH	200-2 Check	New	2018	2018
22	Hillsborough	NH	Market	NH	Merrimack	New	2018	2018
23	Fairfield	CT	Market	CT	Easton	Upgrade	2017	2017
24	Hampden	MA	Market	MA	Longmeadow	New	2017	2017
25	Berkshire	MA	Market	MA	Pittsfield	Upgrade	2017	2017
26	Hartford	CT	Market	CT	North Bloomfield	Upgrade	2017	2017
27	New Haven	CT	Market	CT	Milford	Upgrade	2017	2017
28	Berkshire	MA	Market	MA	North Adams Regulation	New	2017	2017
29	Middlesex	MA	Market	MA	Wilmington Regulation	New	2017	2017

1 Construction schedules for all pipeline, HDD and compression facilities, with the exception of the 300 Line CT Loop, are based on a two year construction window.

## **Attachment b**

### **Differences Between State Environmental Construction Plans (Including Each State's Deviations from the FERC's Plan and Procedures)**

This page intentionally left blank

Differences Between the State Environmental Construction Plans Including Each State's Deviations from the FERC's Plans and Procedures			
Subject	ECP Section	FERC Deviation (Y/N)	Description
Pennsylvania			
Construction ROW Width	2.2; 12.1	Y	Tennessee is proposing to utilize a standard construction ROW width of 100 feet in non-wetland areas, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.A.2). Tennessee is proposing a standard construction width of 75 feet through wetlands and waterbodies, which complies with the FERC guidelines (Plan, IV.A.2).
Temporary slope breaker spacing	5.21; 12.1	Y	Temporary slope breakers (waterbars) will be installed at the maximum spacing noted in Section 5.21 of this ECP. This is in accordance with the PADEP Manual, which supersedes the Plan at IV.F.1.b.
Permanent trench breaker spacing	9.2; 12.1	Y	Tennessee is proposing a modification to the FERC permanent trench breaker spacing. Trench breakers will be spaced in accordance with spacing noted in Section 9.2 for construction in upland areas. The spacing provided in Section 9.2 is in accordance with the PADEP Manual and provides for closer spacing of permanent trench breakers based on slope aspect within Pennsylvania, which supersedes the Plan at V.B.1.
Permanent slope breaker spacing	9.2; 12.1	Y	Tennessee is proposing a modification to the FERC permanent slope breaker spacing. Slope breakers will be spaced in accordance with the spacing provided in Section 9.2 of this ECP. This is more stringent than the FERC guidelines (V.B.2) and is consistent with the PADEP Manual.
Construction timing restrictions	6.1; 12.2	Y	Tennessee is proposing construction timing restrictions in accordance with Table 6.1-1 of this ECP, which supersedes the Procedures (V.B.1).
Permanent and Temporary Access Roads	2.2; 12.2	Y	Tennessee is requesting a variance to Procedures (VI.B.d) for wetland impacts associated with permanent and temporary ARs as provided in table 2.2-4 of this ECP.
Wetland restoration	10.0; 12.2	Y	Tennessee proposes to restore wetlands with seed and mulch in accordance with PADEP or other applicable regulatory agencies. Seed mixes, mulching type, and application rates are in Section 10.0 of this ECP (Procedures VI.C.5).
New York			
Specially Designated Soils in Agricultural Lands	5.6	N	Specially Designated Soils in Agricultural Lands were identified based on guidance from the NYSDAM guidance document, Pipeline Right-of-Way Construction Projects – Agricultural Mitigation through the Stages of Project Planning, Construction/Restoration and Follow-up Monitoring (Rev. 2-11).
Environmental Management and Construction Plan Maps	Attachment K19	N	EM&CP Maps depicting Specially Designated Soils in Agricultural Lands are provided based on guidance from the NYSDAM guidance document, Pipeline Right-of-Way Construction Projects – Agricultural Mitigation through the Stages of Project Planning, Construction/Restoration and Follow-up Monitoring (Rev. 2-11).
Black Cherry Tree Vegetation Near Areas of Active Livestock Use	5.6	N	Areas where black cherry tree vegetation occurs near areas of active livestock use were identified based on guidance from the NYSDAM guidance document, Pipeline Right-of-Way Construction Projects – Agricultural Mitigation through the Stages of Project Planning, Construction/Restoration and Follow-up Monitoring (Rev. 2-11).
Karst Mitigation Plan	4.13; 5.30; Attachment K13	N	Karst terrain is present in the state of NY.
Invasive Species Baseline Maps	Attachment K9-C	N	Invasive Species Inventory Baseline Maps are included for the State of New York.

Subject	ECP Section	FERC Deviation (Y/N)	Description
Erosion control measure inspections	3.2; 5.28; 6.3; 7.8; 12.1	Y	<p>Tennessee is proposing to conduct erosion control measure inspections in accordance with the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On a daily basis in areas of active construction or equipment operation;</li> <li>• A minimum of once a week in areas with no construction or equipment operation;</li> <li>• A minimum of two times per week in areas with no construction or equipment operation and where the disturbance is greater than 5 acres and final stabilization has not been achieved; and</li> <li>• Within 24 hours of each 0.5 inch of rainfall or greater. This means that an inspection will be required once a storm event has produced 0.5 inch, even if the storm event is still continuing. Inspections will be required within 24 hours of the first day of the storm that produces more than 0.5 inch of rainfall and within 24 hours after the end of the storm for multiple day storm events that produce 0.5 inch of rainfall or more per day.</li> </ul>
Construction ROW width	2.2; 12.1	Y	<p>Tennessee is proposing to utilize a standard construction ROW width of 100 feet in non-wetland areas, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.A.2). Tennessee is proposing a standard construction width of 75 feet through wetlands and waterbodies, which complies with the FERC guidelines (Plan, IV.A.2).</p>
Temporary slope breaker spacing	5.21; 5.27; 12.1	Y	<p>Temporary slope breakers (water bars) will be installed at the maximum spacing noted in Section 5.0 of this ECP. The spacing within agricultural lands is noted in the same sections in accordance with the NYS DAM typical Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control drawings and the NYS Standards, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.F.1.b.).</p>
Permanent trench breaker spacing	5.27; 9.2; 12.1	Y	<p>Tennessee is proposing a modification to the FERC permanent trench breaker spacing. Trench breakers will be spaced in accordance with spacing noted in Section 5.27 for construction within agricultural land, as well as for construction in upland areas. The spacing provided for agricultural land is consistent with the NYS DAM spacing requirements within agricultural areas. The spacing provided for construction in upland areas is consistent with the NYS Standards. The spacing noted for either situation is more stringent than the FERC guidelines (Plan at V.B.1).</p>
Permanent slope breaker spacing	9.2; 12.1	Y	<p>Tennessee is proposing a modification to the FERC permanent slope breaker spacing. Slope breakers will be spaced in accordance with the spacing provided in Section 9.2 of this ECP. This is more stringent than the FERC guidelines (V.B.2) and is consistent with the NYS DAM typical Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control drawings and the NYS Standards.</p>
Wetland restoration	10.0; 12.2	Y	<p>Tennessee proposes to restore wetlands with seed and mulch in accordance with NYSDEC or other applicable regulatory agencies. Seed mixes, mulching type, and application rates are in Section 10.0 of this ECP. (Procedures VI.C.5).</p>
Massachusetts			
Karst Mitigation Plan	4.13; 5.30; Attachment L13	N	Karst terrain is present in the state of MA.

## Attachment b

Subject	ECP Section	FERC Deviation (Y/N)	Description
National Scenic Trail Crossings	Attachment L14, Section 3.0	N	Additional section (3.0) to the General Trail Crossing Plan that discusses procedures for crossing the Appalachian Trail and the New England National Scenic Trail.
Construction ROW width	2.2; 12.1	Y	In non-wetland areas, Tennessee is proposing to utilize a standard construction ROW width of 100 feet on the two proposed 30 inch pipelines (Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment and Maritimes Delivery Line) and 90 feet on the three proposed 24 inch pipelines (Concord Delivery Line, Lynnfield Lateral, and Peabody Lateral), which supersedes (Plan, at IV.A.2). Tennessee is proposing a standard construction width of 75 feet on the proposed 20 inch line (Haverhill Lateral) and the proposed 12 inch line (Fitchburg Lateral Extension), as well as through all wetlands and waterbodies, which complies with the FERC guidelines (Plan, IV.A.2).
Temporary slope breakers	5.21; 12.1	Y	Temporary slope breakers (water bars) will be installed at the maximum spacing noted in Section 5.21 of this ECP. This is in accordance with the MADEP Manual, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.F.1.b.).
Wetland restoration	10.0; 12.2	Y	Tennessee proposes to restore wetlands with seed in accordance with MADEP or other applicable regulatory agencies. Seed mixes and application rates are listed in Section 10.4 of this ECP (Procedures VI.C.5).
New Hampshire			
Construction ROW width	2.2; 12.1	Y	Tennessee is proposing to utilize a standard construction ROW width of 100 feet in non-wetland areas, on the proposed 30 inch diameter pipeline (Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment), which supersedes (Plan, at IV.A.2). Tennessee is proposing a standard construction width of 75 feet on the proposed 20 inch line (Haverhill Lateral) and the proposed 12 inch line (Fitchburg Lateral Extension), as well as through all wetlands and waterbodies, which complies with the FERC guidelines (Plan, IV.A.2).
Wetland restoration	10.0; 12.2	Y	Tennessee proposes to restore wetlands with seed and mulch in accordance with NHDES or other applicable regulatory agencies. Seed mixes, mulching type, and application rates are in Section 10.0 of this ECP (Procedures VI.C.5).
Connecticut			
National Scenic Trail Crossings	Attachment N13, Section 3.0	N	Additional section (3.0) to the General Trail Crossing Plan that discusses procedures for crossing the New England National Scenic Trail.
Construction ROW width	2.2; 12.1	Y	Tennessee is proposing to utilize a standard construction ROW width of 90 feet in non-wetland areas, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.A.2). Tennessee is proposing a standard construction width of 75 feet through wetlands and waterbodies, which complies with the FERC guidelines (Plan, IV.A.2).
Wetland restoration	10.0; 12.2	Y	Tennessee proposes to restore wetlands with seed and mulch in accordance with CTDEEP or other applicable regulatory agencies. Seed mixes, mulching type, and application rates are in Section 10.0 of this ECP (Procedures VI.C.5).
Project-wide Deviations from the FERC's Plans and Procedures			
Temporary Slope Breakers	5.21; 12.1	Y	Silt fence, staked hay, straw bales and sand bags will not be used to construct temporary slope breakers, as these barriers are not intended to convey concentrated flow, only minimal sheet flow, which supersedes (Plan, at IV.F.1.a.).

## Attachment b

Subject	ECP Section	FERC Deviation (Y/N)	Description
Stream Crossings	6.7.2; 12.2	Y	In accordance with consultations from state agencies, Tennessee will cross streams with discernible flow at the time of construction via fluming or dam and pump, regardless of fisheries or critical habitat designation. This is more restrictive than the Commission's Procedure's requirements (Section V.B.6).
Workspace greater than 75 feet wide within wetlands	2.3; 12.2	Y	Areas of workspace greater than 75 feet wide within wetlands are identified in Table 2.3-12 of Resource Report 2. Justification for including workspace greater than 75 feet within wetlands also is provided in the table per Commission's Procedure (Section VI.A.3).
ATWS to be located within 50 feet of waterbodies and wetlands	2.2.5; 12.2	Y	Tennessee acknowledges that the Project will require certain ATWS to be located within 50 feet of waterbodies and wetlands. Tennessee has provided site-specific locations of these ATWS and justifications per the Commission's Procedures (Section V.B.2 and VI.B.1.a ) in Resource Report 8.
Permanent Slope Breakers	9.2; 12.2	Y	Tennessee proposes that permanent slope breakers may not always be appropriate for installation at wetland boundaries. At the discretion of the EI, Lead Environmental Inspector ("LEI"), and Tennessee's contractor, permanent slope breakers that may alter the permanent overland flow characteristics, consequently altering the wetland's characteristics, will not be installed. Tennessee proposes the use of hay/straw bales as temporary slope breakers at the wetland boundaries until restoration is complete to ensure the wetland characteristics will remain intact in situations where permanent slope breakers are not used. This exception applies only to the use of a permanent slope breaker per Commission's Procedures (Section VI.C.3).



**Attachment c**  
**Laterals and Volumes**

This page intentionally left blank

Lateral	Volume	Delivery Points	Shipper(s)
Haverhill Lateral	63,199	TGP Lawrence, Haverhill	Bay State Gas Company d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts, Inc., Boston Gas (dba National Grid)
Lynnfield Lateral	227,300	Maple Street Danvers, Essex, Camp Curtis, Everett, Revere, Lynn, Beverly Salem, Gloucester, Wenham, Lynnfield, West Peabody, Burlington, Southbridge, Arlington, Reading, Spencer, Lexington, Wilmington, Longmeadow, Agawam, New Britain, E. Farmington, Easton, N. Bloomfield, Milford, Pittsfield	Boston Gas (dba National Grid), Bay State Gas Company d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts, Inc., Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, Southern Connecticut Gas Corporation, UIL Holdings Corporation, The Berkshire Gas Company
Peabody Lateral	59,516	Maple Street Danvers, Essex, Camp Curtis, Everett, Revere, Lynn, Beverly Salem, Gloucester, Wenham, Lynnfield, West Peabody (Please note that a short segment of the Peabody Lateral is also used to move gas back to the west for the other Lynnfield Lateral Customers)	Boston Gas (dba National Grid)
Maritimes Delivery Line	10,160	Maritimes	Irving Oil Terminals Operations, Inc.
CT Loop	95,000	New Britain, East Farmington, Easton, North Bloomfield, Milford	Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, Southern Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation and UIL Holdings Corporation
Fitchburg Lateral Extension	17,717	Lunenburg, Leominster, Clinton	Boston Gas Company (dba National Grid)

This page intentionally left blank