



PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC

PENNEAST PIPELINE PROJECT

RESOURCE REPORT 4

Cultural Resources

FERC Docket No. CP15-____-000

Final

FERC 7(c) Application

September 2015

Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources FERC Environmental Checklist

PART 380-APPENDIX A MINIMUM FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS	COMPANY COMPLIANCE OR INAPPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> Initial cultural resources consultation and documentation, and documentation of consultation with Native Americans. (§ 380.12(f)(l)(i) & (2)) See § 380.14 for specific procedures.	Section 4.4 Native American Coordination Appendix G1 and Appendix G2 (Privileged) Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence
<input type="checkbox"/> Overview/Survey Report(s). (§ 380.12(f)(l)(ii) & (2)) See § 380.14 for specific procedures.	Appendix J (Privileged) Cultural Resources Survey Reports
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify the Project APE in terms of direct or indirect effects to known cultural resources.	Section 4.6 Areas of Potential Effects for Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide a Project map with mileposts, clearly showing boundaries of all areas surveyed (ROW, extra work areas, access roads, etc.) and to be surveyed with corridor widths clearly specified.	Appendix 4B Archaeological Survey Coverage Appendix 4C Architectural History Survey Coverage
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide documentation of consultation with SHPOs, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), and applicable land-managing agencies regarding the need for and required extent of cultural resource surveys.	Appendix G1 and Appendix G2 (Privileged) Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide a narrative summary of overview results, cultural resource surveys completed, identified cultural resources and any cultural resource issues.	Section 4.7 Cultural Resource Investigations
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide a Project-specific Ethnographic Analysis (can be part of Overview/Survey Report).	Appendix J (Privileged) Cultural Resources Survey Reports
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify by mileposts any areas requiring survey for which the landowner denied access.	Appendix 4E Areas to be Surveyed Pending Landowner Permission
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide written comments on the Overview and Survey Reports, if available, from the SHPOs or THPOs, as appropriate, and applicable land-managing agencies.	Appendix G1 Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence: comments anticipated October 2015
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide a Summary Table of completion status of cultural resource surveys and SHPO or THPO and land-managing agency comments on the reports.	Table 4.8-1 Summary of Completion Status of Cultural Resources Surveys

PART 380-APPENDIX A MINIMUM FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

COMPANY COMPLIANCE OR INAPPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT

Provide a Summary Table of identified cultural resources, and SHPO or THPO and land-managing agency comments on the eligibility recommendations for those resources.

Table 4.7-5 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania;
 Table 4.7-6 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania;
 Table 4.7-7; Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in New Jersey;
 Table 4.7-8 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW in New Jersey;
 Appendix 4D Newly Identified Historic Architectural Resources

Provide a brief summary of the status of Native American consultation, including copies of all related correspondence and records of verbal communications.

Section 4.4 Native American Coordination
 Appendix G Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence

Provide a schedule for completing any outstanding cultural resource studies.

Section 4.8 Outstanding Surveys

Provide an Unanticipated Discovery Plan for the Project area, referencing appropriate state statutes.

Appendix K Unanticipated Discovery Plan

Contents

Section	Page
4.0	CULTURAL RESOURCES..... 4-1
4.1	Introduction 4-1
4.2	Scope and Authority 4-1
4.3	Agency Consultation 4-2
4.3.1	State Historic Preservation Office Consultation..... 4-2
4.3.2	National Park Service 4-4
4.4	Native American Coordination 4-4
4.5	Additional Coordination with Agency and Non-Agency Groups 4-5
4.6	Area of Potential Effects for Cultural Resources 4-20
4.6.1	Area of Potential Effects for Archaeological Resources 4-20
4.6.2	Area of Potential Effects for Historic Architectural Resources..... 4-20
4.7	Cultural Resources Investigations 4-21
4.7.1	Overview Results..... 4-21
4.7.2	Archaeological Survey Results..... 4-28
4.7.3	Architectural History Survey Results 4-35
4.8	Outstanding Surveys..... 4-38
4.9	Summary 4-40
4.9.1	Pennsylvania..... 4-40
4.9.2	New Jersey..... 4-40
4.10	Cumulative Impacts..... 4-41
4.11	References 4-42

Tables

- 4.4-1 Native American Coordination
- 4.5-1 Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resources Concerns
- 4.7-1 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within the 400-Foot Study Corridor in Pennsylvania
- 4.7-2 Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor in Pennsylvania
- 4.7-3 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within the 400-Foot Study Corridor in New Jersey
- 4.7-4 Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor in New Jersey
- 4.7-5 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania
- 4.7-6 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania
- 4.7-7 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in New Jersey
- 4.7-8 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW in New Jersey
- 4.8-1 Summary of Completion Status of Cultural Resources Surveys

Appendices

- Appendix 4A Native American Coordination
- Appendix 4B Archaeological Survey Coverage
- Appendix 4C Architectural History Survey Coverage
- Appendix 4D Newly Identified and Recommended Eligible Historic Architectural Resources
 - Table 4D-1 Newly Identified Historic Architectural Resources in Pennsylvania
 - Table 4D-2 Newly Identified Historic Architectural Resources in New Jersey
- Appendix 4E Areas to be Surveyed Pending Landowner Permission

4.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.1 Introduction

PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC (PennEast) has prepared this Resource Report to support its application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (Certificate) for the PennEast Pipeline Project (Project). PennEast designed its Project to provide a direct and flexible path for transporting natural gas produced in the Marcellus Shale production region in eastern Pennsylvania to growing natural gas markets in New Jersey, eastern Pennsylvania, southeastern Pennsylvania, and surrounding states with the capability of providing approximately 1.1 MMDth/day of year-round natural gas transportation service.

This Resource Report focuses on the Project facilities and locations that PennEast selected as of September, 2015.

The Project consists of the following primary components:

- 114 miles of new 36-inch diameter mainline pipeline extending from Dallas Township in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania to Hopewell Township in Mercer County, New Jersey;
- 2.1-miles of new 24-inch diameter lateral near Hellertown, Northampton County, PA to transport gas to an interconnection with Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC (Columbia Gas) and UGI Utilities, Inc.(UGI Utilities);
- 0.6-mile of new 12-inch diameter lateral near Holland Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey to transport gas to Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. (d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas) (Elizabethtown Gas) and NRG REMA, LLC's Gilbert Power Station;
- 1.4-miles of new 36-inch diameter lateral in West Amwell Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey to transport gas to an interconnection with Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC (Algonquin) and Texas Eastern Transmission, LP (Texas Eastern);
- One new compressor station in Carbon County, Pennsylvania; and
- Various associated aboveground facilities including interconnects, launchers, receivers, and mainline block valves to support the pipeline system.

The Project will be rated for a maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of 1,480 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). Figure 1.2-1 in Resource Report 1 provides a Project Overview Map showing the locations of the proposed pipeline route and associated facilities. A detailed discussion of the Project route selection and alternatives analysis is contained in Resource Report 10.

Resource Report 4 provides information regarding cultural resources for the proposed PennEast Project. This resource report describes the cultural resources in the Project area and evaluates the potential impacts of construction and operation of the Project on these resources. PennEast obtained the information contained in this resource report from field surveys, review of available literature, and consultation with various federal, state, and local regulatory agencies. Appendix G1 and Appendix G2 (Privileged), Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence, include agency correspondence and Native American tribal coordination documents.

4.2 Scope and Authority

The Project requires approvals and permits from Federal, state, and local entities. One of the Federal level requirements is a FERC Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity under Section 7(c) of the National Gas Act. As a result, the Project is being reviewed under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended. Prior to authorizing an undertaking, in this case issuance of a Certificate for the Project, Section 106 of the NHPA requires Federal agencies,

including FERC, to take into account the effect of that undertaking on cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 60). The agency must also afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) the opportunity to comment on the undertaking.

The primary goals of cultural resource investigations conducted as part of the Section 106 review for the Project are to: 1) locate, document, and evaluate buildings, structures, objects, districts, landscapes, and archaeological sites that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP; 2) assess potential effects of the Project on those resources, and 3) provide recommendations for subsequent treatment of those resources, if necessary, to assist with compliance with Section 106.

In addition to Section 106, the cultural resources investigation was conducted for the Project in accordance with the following documents:

- The FERC Office of Energy Projects' Guidelines for Reporting on Cultural Resources Investigations (2002);
- The U.S. Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (48 Federal Regulations [FR] 44716-42, 1983);
- Section 380.3 of FERC's regulations;
- Cultural Resource Management in Pennsylvania: Guidelines for Archeological Investigations (PHMC 2008);
- Guidelines for Architectural Investigations (PHMC 2014);
- Survey Guidelines for Pipeline Projects – Above Ground Resources June 2013 (PHMC 2013);
- Guidelines for Architectural Survey (NJHPO 2004); and
- Guidelines for Phase I Archaeological Investigations: Identification of Archaeological Resources (NJHPO 2004).

PennEast prepared and submitted survey reports for archaeological and historic architectural properties identification work to the relevant State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs). Copies of the reports are included in Appendix J (Privileged). Due to the sensitive nature of the material within the archaeological survey reports and technical memoranda, the covers and all pages are labeled "CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE" in accordance with 36 CFR 800.11(c)(1) and the report is included in Volume III.

4.3 Agency Consultation

4.3.1 State Historic Preservation Office Consultation

PennEast initiated Section 106 consultation with the SHPOs in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Copies of correspondence with the Pennsylvania and New Jersey SHPOs are included in Appendix G1 and G2 (Privileged), Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence. Consultation undertaken with these agencies is summarized below.

Survey reports for archaeological and historic architectural surveys on parcels to which survey access had been granted as of July 2015 have been submitted to the relevant SHPOs. The SHPOs have not yet issued comments on those reports; it is expected that comments will be received in mid-October, at which time they will be filed with FERC. Additional surveys will be conducted when survey permissions are granted; the results of the additional surveys will be documented in addendum reports that will be submitted to the SHPOs for review and comment. All addendum reports and agency comments on them will be filed with FERC.

4.3.1.1 Pennsylvania

The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) serves as the SHPO for Pennsylvania. On August 20, 2014, PennEast submitted a detailed scoping letter to the PHMC that included Project mapping, reviewed the results of preliminary background research, and outlined the proposed methodology for identification-level archaeological and architectural history surveys for the Project (Appendix G2 [Privileged]). The scoping letter also included an Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP) guiding the treatment of human remains and archaeological sites that might be discovered during Project construction. The PHMC concurred with the survey methodologies and the UDP in a letter dated September 10, 2014.

PennEast notified the PHMC of Project reroutes in Pennsylvania in letters dated October 24, 2014 and October 25, 2014 (Appendix G1). These transmittals included maps of the reroutes and electronic shapefiles. The PHMC responded to these submittals in a letter dated December 4, 2014, in which they acknowledged the route changes and reiterated that the methodologies for identifying archaeological sites and historic architectural properties presented in the scoping letter had been approved (Appendix G1). PennEast notified the PHMC of additional Project reroutes in letters dated January 14, 2015, March 31, 2015, and July 27, 2015 that also included maps of the reroutes (Appendix G1). The PHMC responded to the January 14, 2015, letter on March 2, 2015, in which they stated the need for Phase I archaeological survey and an assessment of effect for one previously identified, potentially eligible historic architectural property. The PHMC comments on PennEast's letter dated March 31, 2015 and July 27, 2015 have not been received. If the PHMC comments on these letters are received, they will be filed with FERC.

4.3.1.2 New Jersey

On August 20, 2014, PennEast submitted a detailed scoping letter to the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO) that included Project mapping, a review of the results of preliminary background research, and a proposed methodology for identification-level archaeological and architectural history surveys for the Project (Appendix G2 [Privileged]). The scoping letter also included a UDP guiding the treatment of human remains and archaeological sites that might be discovered during Project construction. On August 26, 2014, PennEast requested a meeting with NJHPO to discuss the Project. The meeting was held on September 16, 2014, and was attended by PennEast cultural resources staff and NJHPO reviewers. The meeting included a review of proposed methodology and NJHPO requirements and expectations. The NJHPO formally responded to the Project scoping letter on September 24, 2014, with a series of comments that they requested be addressed in a revised scoping document. NJHPO also requested that the UDP be revised. PennEast submitted the revised scoping document, including the updated UDP, to NJHPO on February 2, 2015. NJHPO provided comments on February 18, 2015, in which they stated that all of their comments on the earlier document had been addressed, with the exception of additional information on the sensitivity model. The requested information regarding the sensitivity model was provided to NJHPO in a letter dated March 6, 2015. NJHPO responded on April 8, 2015 accepting the revised site sensitivity model. The revised model is being applied to the ongoing archaeological field studies.

On April 9, 2015, NJHPO contacted PennEast to inform them of two resources reported by a local landowner. A field meeting was held on April 20, 2015 between the landowner and NJHPO and PennEast representatives. PennEast followed up with NJHPO regarding these resources between May 4 and 6, 2015, and again on June 4, 2015.

PennEast notified NJHPO of Project reroutes in New Jersey in letters dated October 24, 2014, January 14, 2015, March 31, 2015, and July 27, 2015. These transmittals included electronic shapefiles and maps of the reroutes. NJHPO acknowledged receipt of the October 24, 2014, March 31, 2015, and

July 27, 2015 letters but did not provide comments. NJHPO comments on the January 14, 2015, letter included a request for a new work plan for the rerouted area. The revised scoping letter that was sent to NJHPO on February 2, 2015, included the requested information, and, as stated above, NJHPO accepted the revisions on February 18, 2015.

4.3.2 National Park Service

The proposed route crosses the Appalachian Trail (a NRHP-eligible property) between mileposts 51.1 and 51.2 in Lehigh Township, Northampton County, Pennsylvania on land owned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. PennEast is consulting with the State of Pennsylvania and the National Park Service to minimize impacts to the Appalachian Trail. Resource Report 8 provides details regarding ongoing consultation for the Appalachian Trail.

4.4 Native American Coordination

PennEast initiated coordination with federally recognized Native American groups with historical connections to the Project area. Section 4.4 summarizes coordination with Native American groups to date.

On December 31, 2014, PennEast sent letters to 15 federally recognized Native American tribes with a demonstrated interest in the area crossed by the Project. The letters, included in Appendix G1, introduced the Project and provided detailed mapping of the proposed alignment. The Native American tribes contacted for the Project and the status of coordination efforts are provided in Table 4.4-1. PennEast subsequently followed up the initial contacts with phone calls to individuals and/or tribes that did not respond to the letters. PennEast engaged in additional coordination via email, telephone, and mail with tribes that expressed interest in the Project. Copies of correspondence and records of phone conversations are included in Appendix G1. Appendix 4A provides a summary of coordination efforts with the 15 tribes.

The tribes contacted were initially identified based on maps of their historic territories (Trigger 1978) and from a list provided by NJHPO (the PHMC does not maintain contact lists for federally recognized Native American tribes). Tribal leaders and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) were identified using the Bureau of Indian Affairs Tribal Leaders Directory (2014), the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (n.d.), and on-line research. After the initial coordination letters were issued and delivery confirmations received, PennEast attempted to contact individuals who had not responded. If an individual could not be reached, PennEast contacted the tribal office to confirm the original letter was sent to the correct person. In cases where tribal staffing had changed, PennEast re-sent Project initiation letters to the individuals identified by the tribal offices as the current representatives. Current tribal representatives were confirmed for 10 of the 15 tribes, and, for each, the appropriate individual was provided with the opportunity to review the Project and respond. PennEast was unable to establish contact with 5 of the 15 tribal groups.

Responses were obtained from seven of the 10 tribes for which the current tribal representative was confirmed (summary table in Appendix 4A; copies of correspondence in Appendix G1). The remaining three tribes did not respond despite multiple attempts to make contact with the individuals identified by the tribal offices as the appropriate contacts. PennEast provided all information gathered during the Native American coordination phase to FERC, who subsequently initiated government-to-government consultation.

**Table 4.4-1
Native American Coordination**

Native American Tribe	Coordination Status
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Representative confirmed, no response
Cayuga Nation	Representative confirmed, no response
Delaware Nation	Requested consulting party status
Delaware Tribe of Indians	Requested consulting party status
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	Representative confirmed, no response
Oneida Indian Nation	Requested consulting party status
Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	Representative not confirmed
Onondaga Nation	Representative not confirmed
Seneca Nation of Indians	Requested continued coordination if Project changes
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma	Representative not confirmed
Shawnee Tribe	Requested continued coordination if Project changes
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe	Requested consulting party status
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans	Requested continued coordination
Tonawanda Seneca Nation	Representative not confirmed
Tuscarora Nation	Representative not confirmed

4.5 Additional Coordination with Agency and Non-Agency Groups

As documented in Resource Report 1 (Table 1.7-3), PennEast has engaged in extensive consultation with stakeholders throughout the planning process, including all affected counties and municipalities. PennEast has responded to various inquiries regarding cultural resources submitted by agency and non-agency groups and individuals throughout the Project process. Comments concerning cultural resources in and near the Project area were submitted during the public comment period, January 13 – March 20, 2015. Additional comments and inquiries have also been submitted directly to PennEast’s cultural resource specialists. The agency and non-agency groups and individuals included county and municipal councils and committees, elected officials, school districts, historic preservation commissions, historical societies, individual professionals, and land owners. Table 4.5-1 summarizes the comments and provides responses for cultural resource issues raised by agency and non-agency groups during the Project process thus far.

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Swetland Homestead	Wyoming Township, Luzerne County, PA	Public Comment	Swetland Homestead is a NRHP-listed property (NRHP ID: 78002427) that is located at 855 Wyoming Avenue in Wyoming Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. It is situated approximately 750-feet southwest of the proposed Project centerline. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary right-of-way (ROW) (direct area of potential effects (APE)) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the PHMC. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
Wyoming Monument	Wyoming Township, Luzerne County, PA	Public Comment	Wyoming Monument is a NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 02000509) that is located at the corner of Wyoming Avenue and Susquehanna Street in Wyoming Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. It is situated approximately 630-feet northeast of the proposed Project centerline. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary ROW (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the PHMC. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor (NHC)	Multiple Counties, PA	FERC	The Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor (D&L NHC) is a 165-mile trail highlighting Pennsylvania's coal and iron industry between Wilkes-Barre to Philadelphia. National Heritage Areas (NHAs) are designated by Congress as places where natural, cultural, and

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			historic resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally important landscape. Many historic resources within the D&L NHC are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, while others have been identified, but not evaluated for NRHP-eligibility. PennEast has conducted background research at the PHMC to gather information on these previously identified resources, which are listed in Section 4.7, Table 4.7-2. PennEast has also consulted inventory documents prepared by the D&L and is conducting field studies to identify previously unidentified resources within the D&L NHC. PennEast will continue to consult with the PHMC on issues of eligibility and potential effects.
Appalachian Trail	Lehigh Township, Northampton County, PA	Public Comment	See Section 4.3.2
Jacob Arndt House	Williams Township, Northampton County, PA	Public Comment	The Jacob Arndt House is a NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 05001489) that is located at 910 Raubsville Road in Williams Township, Northampton County, Pennsylvania. It is situated 1 ¼-mile east of the proposed Project centerline. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary ROW (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the PHMC. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
Coffeetown Gristmill	Williams Township, Northampton County, PA	Public Comment	The Coffeetown Gristmill is a NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 77001179) that is located at the intersection of Coffeetown Road and Kressman Road in Williams Township, Northampton County, Pennsylvania. It is situated approximately 1 ½-mile east of the proposed Project centerline. PennEast has developed a

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			<p>comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary right-of-way (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the PHMC. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.</p>
Hexenkopf Rock/Hexenkopf Hill	Williams Township, Northampton County, PA	Public Comment	<p>Hexenkopf Rock/Hexenkopf Hill is a prominent landscape feature; its slopes are proposed to be crossed by the Project. Translated as "Witch's Head," this feature was the subject of local folklore from the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries. Local stories relative to the landscape feature include accounts of witches and ghosts as well as use of the area for Pennsylvania German folk medicine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. An amateur archaeologist in the late nineteenth century claimed that the feature was a spiritual site used by the Lenape. PennEast has not received any indication from federally recognized Lenape groups (the Delaware Nation, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans) that this feature is of cultural significance. PennEast has not performed an archaeological survey of Hexenkopf Rock/Hexenkopf Hill due to lack of survey permission. When survey permission becomes available, PennEast will perform an archaeological survey according to the methods approved by the PHMC.</p>
Isaac Stout House	Williams Township, Northampton County, PA	Public Comment	<p>The Isaac Stout House is a NRHP-listed (NRHP ID: 04000834) property that is located at 50 Durham Road in Williams Township, Northampton County, Pennsylvania. The house and barn ruins are located approximately 300-500-feet northeast of the proposed Project centerline. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct APE and therefore, the Project will have no direct impacts on the buildings or</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			structures. The proposed route crosses through agricultural fields and Frey's Run to the west and southwest of the buildings and structures that may require tree removal. PennEast will continue to consult with the PHMC on the potential for indirect (or viewshed) impacts.
Delaware Canal	Durham Township, Bucks County PA	FERC, Public Comment	The Delaware Division of the Pennsylvania Canal is a National Historic Landmark and a NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 74001756) that was built in 1832 to transport anthracite from northeastern Pennsylvania to Philadelphia. The canal stretches from Easton (where it connects to the Lehigh Canal) to Bristol. The proposed route crosses the Delaware Canal in Durham Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. As currently designed, horizontal directional drilling will be used to install the proposed pipeline under the canal. The entry/exit points of the pipeline will be approximately 950-feet west of the canal district boundaries in Pennsylvania, and over 1,800-feet east of the canal boundaries in New Jersey. Since none of the physical features associated with the canal district or within the viewshed of the canal will be impacted, PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
Durham Cave	Durham Township, Bucks County, PA	Public Comment	Durham Cave is a limestone cave located approximately 0.18 mile south of the Study Corridor. The cave, listed in the PHMC's Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey as Site 36BU0196, was used by Native Americans. Based on the current proposed route, Durham Cave does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
Cooks Creek Heritage Area	Durham Township, Bucks County, PA	Public Comment	The Cooks Creek Heritage Area (also known as the Durham Heritage Area) is a potentially eligible historic district in Durham Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Information nominating the district to the NRHP has been submitted to the PHMC in 2014-2015, but to date, no official determination by the PHMC has been made public. This rural historic district is significant for its association with the industrial development of the Durham Furnace and the Delaware Canal.

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			<p>Preliminary boundary maps prepared by an independent cultural resource professional suggest that the potential district may be intersected by the proposed Project centerline. Survey and evaluation of this resource is ongoing. PennEast will continue to consult with the PHMC on issues of eligibility and potential effects.</p>
<p>Pursley's Ferry Historic District</p>	<p>Holland Township, Hunterdon County, NJ</p>	<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Pursley's Ferry Historic District is a SRHP/NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 80002495) that is located along the Delaware River in Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. The north end of the district is situated approximately one-quarter mile south of the proposed Project centerline. As currently designed, horizontal directional drilling will be used at the crossing of the Delaware River and the entry/exit point will be one-quarter mile east of the river shore and over 1,000-foot northeast of the historic district. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic district does not fall within the direct APE and therefore, the Project will have no direct impacts on the contributing buildings or structures. The proposed route would cross under a wooded area just east of the river shore and north of the historic district, but because the HDD construction will not require tree removal, indirect visual effects are not anticipated.</p>
<p>Rosemont Rural Agricultural District</p>	<p>Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ</p>	<p>New Jersey Conservation Foundation; Delaware Township; Public Comment</p>	<p>Rosemont Rural Agricultural District is a SRHP/NRHP-listed historic district (NRHP ID: 10000354) that is centered on Rosemont-Ringoes Road in Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. As currently designed, the proposed Project centerline transects the center of the district, north to south crossing through agricultural fields, fence and tree rows, and forested woodland. Based on a review of historic aerials, many of these landscape patterns were present as early as the 1930s. PennEast has co-located most of the line through the District adjacent to an existing transmission line corridor in an effort to minimize environmental impacts. However, as an agricultural district with agricultural-related landscape features as part of its significance,</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Covered Bridge Historic District	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	New Jersey Conservation Foundation; Public Comment	<p>damage or destruction of these historic features may result in a direct adverse effect. PennEast will continue to consult with NJHPO on the potential effects to this resource.</p> <p>The Covered Bridge Historic District is a NRHP-listed resource (NRHP ID: 99000269) that is located near the intersection of Pine Hill Road and Rosemont Ringoes Road in Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. It is located adjacent to the Rosemont Rural Agricultural Historic District, approximately one-half-mile northeast of the proposed Project centerline. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary ROW (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the NJHPO. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.</p>
Sandy Ridge Church and Cemetery	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Public Comment	<p>The Sandy Ridge Church and Cemetery are located at the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road and Cemetery Road in Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. The property is located approximately one-quarter mile east of the proposed Project centerline. The church was established in 1819 and the current edifice was constructed in 1866. The church and cemetery are not listed in the SRHP or NRHP and have not been determined eligible by the NJHPO or the Keeper of the NRHP. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary ROW (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the NJHPO. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, this historic property does not fall within the</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to this resource.
B19-25: 84 Sanford Road B19-29: 8 Hewitt Road B31-5: 780 Route 604 B31-9: 160 Route 519 B32-13: 56 Route 519 B32-30: 760 Rosemont Ringoes Road B53-5: 960 Route 523 B56-16: 945 Route 523 B56-19: 26 Grafton Road B59-1: 12 Seabrook Road B61-7&8.01: 218 Sandy Ridge-Mt. Airy Road B62-1: 4 Hamp Road B31-12: 31 Sanford Road B54-1.03: 881	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Delaware Township	These historic architectural resources are located within Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey and were identified as cultural resource concerns by Delaware Township in a letter to FERC dated February 10, 2015. PennEast has developed a comprehensive plan for identifying historic properties within the permanent and temporary ROW (direct APE) of the proposed route, as well as within the line of sight (indirect APE) of proposed above-ground facilities and areas where landscape alterations may occur. This plan has been developed in collaboration with the NJHPO. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, these historic resources do not fall within the direct or indirect APE. PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to these resources.

**Table 4.5-1
 Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Sergeantsville Road D449: Stone Arch Bridge on Worman Rd			
B19-37: 35 Hewitt Road			
B19-21: 60 Sanford Road			
B31-3: 740 Rosemont-Ringoes Road			
B31-4: 760 Rosemont-Ringoes Road			
B32-32: 745 Rosemont-Ringoes Road			
B33-19: 156 Lower Creek Road	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Delaware Township	
B55-2.03: 34 Sandy Ridge Road			
B55-3: 65 Brookville Hollow Road			
B55-8: 20 Sandy Ridge Road			
B60-12: 70 Brookville Hollow Road			
B62-12: 40 Lambertville- Headquarters Road			

These historic architectural resources are located within Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey and were identified as cultural resource concerns by Delaware Township in a letter to FERC dated February 10, 2015. These resources fall within the APE for historic architectural resources and will require survey and evaluation to assess their eligibility for listing in the SRHP and NRHP, as well as an assessment of the potential effects resulting from Project activities. However, the landowners for these properties have not granted survey permission, so architectural history investigations have not yet been conducted.

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
B32-5: 155 Lower Creek Road	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Delaware Township	This resource is located within Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey, and was identified as a cultural resource of concern by Delaware Township in a letter to FERC dated February 10, 2015. This property falls within the direct APE and was surveyed by an architectural history team in June 2015. This property is included in Appendix 4D, Table 4D-2 (Survey Code HU-0210), and is mapped in Appendix 4C. It is also addressed in the Reconnaissance-Level Survey report located in Appendix J, which has been submitted to NJHPO for review and comment. PennEast is recommending this property not eligible for listing in the SRHP or NRHP.
B53-2: 892 Sergeantsville Road B53-1.03: 112 Worman Road	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Delaware Township Historical Society	<p>These resources are located within Delaware Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey, and were identified as cultural resources of concern by the Delaware Township Historical Society in a letter/email to FERC dated August 15, 2015. The property at B53-2 falls within the (APE) for historic architectural resources and will require survey and evaluation to assess the eligibility for listing in the SRHP and NRHP, as well as an assessment of the potential effects resulting from Project activities. However, the landowners for this property have not granted survey permission, so architectural history investigations have not yet been conducted.</p> <p>Background research and desktop studies conducted on the property at B53-1.03 indicate that the property does not contain historic resources (buildings, structures, objects, districts, or landscapes) over 48 years of age, and as a result, does not require survey or evaluation to assess the eligibility for listing in the SRHP and NRHP, or an assessment of the potential effects resulting from Project activities.</p>
Rockhopper Trail, Rock Road	West Amwell, Hunterdon County, NJ	Public Comment	The Rockhopper Trail, also known as Rock Road and “the road along the rocks” is an eighteenth-century road trace that stretches five miles between Lambertville and Rocktown, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. The road was used as a public thoroughfare until 1870 when the

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
			<p>Lambertville Water Company established a waterworks on Rock Road and the Rocktown Lambertville Road was constructed to the north as an alternate route to Rocktown. Intact portions of the road are bordered by low, dry-laid rock fence. As currently designed, the proposed Project centerline transects Rock Road just south of an existing transmission line corridor and falls within the direct APE. As discussed in Section 4.3.1.2, PennEast met with representatives of NJHPO and local property owners on April 20, 2015 to view the resource in the field. NJHPO said that the resource would likely be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP and requested that PennEast document the portion of the resource within the Project APE. The reconnaissance-level survey of the Rock Road suggests that the section within the Project APE may have lost integrity as the result of transmission-line related construction. Documentation and evaluation is ongoing. PennEast will continue to consult with NJHPO on eligibility and potential effects.</p>
Potters' Field (burial area)	West Amwell, Hunterdon County, NJ	Public Comment	<p>Local property owners contacted NJHPO in April 2015 to report the possible presence of a 19th-century potter's field on a tract through which the PennEast pipeline will pass. PennEast met with the property owners and representatives of NJHPO on April 20, 2015 to discuss the resource and view the potential location in the field. Subsequent consultation with NJHPO between May 4 and 6, 2015, established an acceptable testing methodology to identify burials. As per that consultation, PennEast will conduct a ground-penetrating radar survey supplemented by close-interval shovel testing when the area becomes available for survey, pending the lifting of mowing restrictions due to the presence of habitat for protected ground-nesting bird species. Survey is expected to occur in October 2015.</p>
Pleasant Valley Historic District	Hopewell Township, Hunterdon County,	Public Comment	<p>The Pleasant Valley Historic District is a SRHP/NRHP-listed (NRHP ID: 91000676) that is centered on Pleasant Valley Road in Hopewell Township, Mercer County, New Jersey. As currently designed, the</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
	NJ		<p>proposed Project centerline transects the center of the district, northwest to southeast on the south side of an existing transmission line corridor. The proposed pipeline would cross through agricultural fields, fence and tree rows, and forested woodland. Based on a review of historic aerials, many of these landscape patterns were present as early as the 1930s. As an agricultural district with agricultural-related landscape features as part of its significance, damage or destruction of these historic features may result in a direct adverse effect. Similarly, removal of these landscape features may also compromise the setting of the district, resulting in an indirect adverse effect. PennEast will continue to consult with NJHPO on the potential effects to this resource.</p>
Howell Living History Farm	Hopewell Township, Hunterdon County, NJ	Public Comment	<p>The Howell Living History Farm is a SRHP-NRHP listed individual resource known as the Joseph Phillips Farm (NRHP ID: 77000879) as well as being a contributing resource to the SRHP/NRHP-listed Pleasant Valley Historic District (NRHP ID: 91000676). The property is located approximately 270-feet north of the proposed Project centerline. Based on the current proposed route and associated features, the Joseph Phillips Farm does not fall within the direct or indirect APE and as a result, PennEast does not anticipate any impacts to the individually NRHP-listed Joseph Phillips Farm. For details on potential impacts to the Pleasant Valley Historic District, see the discussion above.</p>
Revolutionary War battle sites, encampments, and troop movements; Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage	Hunterdon and Mercer Counties, NJ	FERC; Public Comment	<p>The Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area (Crossroads NHA) was authorized by the U.S. Congress in 2011. The mission of the Crossroads NHA is to foster the preservation and interpretation of Revolutionary War era sites and landscapes in New Jersey, and it encompasses more than 2,000 acres in 14 counties. The PennEast Project crosses through an area of wartime activity recognized by the Crossroads NHA from the south end of the line in Mercer County northwards to modern Route 202 in Hunterdon County.</p>

**Table 4.5-1
 Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Area (NHA)			<p>No archaeological sites or historic architectural resources (including historic landscapes) directly related to Revolutionary War activities have been recorded within the PennEast Study Corridor, but major skirmishes occurred near Lambertville in 1776 and 1778 and near Pennington in 1776. Washington’s 1778 route to Monmouth crossed the Project corridor south of modern Route 202 possibly on what is now a road trace known as Rock Road. Archaeological testing to date has not uncovered any evidence of Revolutionary War activity, but the survey is not yet complete. As currently designed, the proposed Project centerline transects Rock Road just south of an existing transmission line corridor and falls within the direct APE. PennEast met with representatives of NJHPO and local property owners on April 20, 2015, to view the resource in the field. NJHPO said that the resource would likely be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP and requested that PennEast document the portion of the resource within the Project APE. The reconnaissance-level survey of the Rock Road suggests that the section within the Project APE may have lost integrity as the result of transmission-line related construction. PennEast will continue to consult with NJHPO on eligibility and potential effects to Rock Road. As for other battle sites, encampments, and troop movements, PennEast will continue to conduct background research on the location of historic landscapes related to the Revolutionary War. As with other resources identified within the APE, the landscapes will be documented and evaluated according to SRHP/NRHP criteria and recommendations on their potential eligibility will be submitted for review and comment to NJHPO.</p>
Argillite workshop	Kingwood Township, Hunterdon County	Public Comment	<p>On May 16, 2015, a local property owner mailed a letter to the New Jersey State Museum (NJSM), Bureau of Archaeology and Ethnology, documenting research regarding a prehistoric archaeological site on his property. On June 30, 2015, an avocational archaeologist emailed PennEast’s cultural resources consultant directly to comment on the</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Indian Habitations	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County	Delaware Township	<p>same archaeological site. The site is a large stone-tool workshop registered as site 28-Hu-394 by the NJSM. The site was first noted in 1917, as reported in Bulletin 18 of New Jersey Geological Society by Max Schrabisch, and has not been investigated since. PennEast has not performed an archaeological survey of the mapped location of this site due to lack of survey permission. When survey permission becomes available, PennEast will perform an archaeological survey according to the methods approved by the NJHPO.</p> <p>Delaware Township expressed concerns regarding Native American sites during the scoping period. The Township, in their letter to FERC on February 10, 2015, referenced Max Schrabish's early twentieth-century map of Native American sites published by the Geological Survey of New Jersey. These sites are recorded at the NJSM and have been included in PennEast's planning and analysis. As mapped by NJSM, none of the Schrabisch sites in Delaware Township intersect the Study Corridor. The Delaware Township Historical Society has also developed cultural resources mapping for Delaware Township, which is available as a KMZ file (http://historymapping.org) and appears to be the source of information included on the maps in Delaware Township's comment letter. None of the Indian Habitation sites included in the KMZ or on Delaware Township's maps intersect the Project corridor. As noted by the Township, mapping of the Schrabish sites is approximate. An archaeological survey is being conducted within the Study Corridor throughout Delaware Township according to methods approved by NJHPO. To date, no archaeological sites have been identified within the Study Corridor in Delaware Township, but PennEast has not completed an archaeological survey due to lack of survey permission. When survey permission becomes available, PennEast will continue to perform an archaeological survey according to the methods approved by the NJHPO.</p>

**Table 4.5-1
Agency and Non-Agency Cultural Resource Concerns**

Cultural Resource Issue	Location	Source	Response
Revolutionary War Encampments	Delaware Township, Hunterdon County	Delaware Township	Delaware Township’s comments during the scoping period included specific concerns about the proximity of the proposed pipeline to sites associated with Revolutionary War encampments. The Township expressed particular concern about a Washington Encampment depicted on mid-nineteenth-century maps in the vicinity of Route 202. The current alignment is more than 1/2 mile away from the mapped location of the encampment, but the Lambertville Lateral intersects the area the Township has mapped as “Washington’s Amwell Encampments” (according to the KMZ file from http://historymapping.org . Penn). PennEast has not completed an archaeological survey of this area due to lack of survey permission. When survey permission becomes available, PennEast will perform an archaeological survey according to the methods approved by the NJHPO.
Impact to Native American artifacts and infringement on Native peoples’ historic sites and villages	Multiple	Public Comment	As per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, PennEast will identify archaeological resources within the pipeline’s APE and make recommendations regarding their eligibility for listing in the NRHP to FERC, the PHMC, and the NJHPO. PennEast is making extensive efforts to avoid archaeological resources during the siting process. See Sections 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7.

4.6 Area of Potential Effects for Cultural Resources

The APE for cultural resources is the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character of or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist” (36 CFR 800.16(d)).

As stated above, the APE comprises two distinct types of potential impacts: direct and indirect. The direct APE is considered to be the zone of ground disturbance that the Project’s land requirements would create during construction of the pipeline and related facilities. The pipeline will be constructed within a 100- to 125-foot-wide corridor encompassing both permanent and temporary construction ROWs. The indirect APE includes historic architectural resources within the line-of-sight of the direct APE. Because the majority of the Project will be below ground surface, the impact on historic architectural resources is expected to be minimal.

Aside from aboveground Project infrastructure (like the compressor stations), noise and vibration impacts on cultural resources are expected to be temporary and limited to the period of construction. For aboveground resources that are immediately adjacent to construction activities, noise and vibration are expected to have limited effects. Along with measures proposed to control and monitor activities during construction in immediate proximity to historic aboveground resources (including, but not limited to the Delaware Canal and historic covered bridges), such as denoting "environmentally sensitive area" on construction plans and demarcation of the zone of construction by orange fencing, it is recommended that the Environmental Inspectors monitor the effects of sound and vibration when ground-disturbing activities (including clearing, grading, trenching and restoration) occur near a historic property, through photography and daily inspection logs before, during and after construction, and in discussions with property owners of those resources.

4.6.1 Area of Potential Effects for Archaeological Resources

The final APE for archaeological resources consists of ROW and workspace configurations shown on the final alignment sheets (temporary and permanent ROW). The results presented in this Resource Report are focused on the archaeological APE. Some archaeological sites were identified outside the archaeological APE because survey was conducted within a 400-foot-wide Study Corridor centered on the centerline of the preferred alternative route for the pipeline and the laterals to allow for minor modifications to the preferred alternative pipeline route to avoid resources. This approach was presented to the SHPOs in the Project scoping letters for Pennsylvania and New Jersey (included in Appendix G2 [Privileged]) and was accepted by the PHMC on September 10, 2014, and by NJHPO on February 18, 2015.

4.6.2 Area of Potential Effects for Historic Architectural Resources

The APE for historic architectural resources encompasses properties within the limits of ground disturbance (direct APE), as well as adjacent properties that may be visually or contextually affected by the construction or operation of the proposed Project (indirect APE).

The direct APE includes all areas within the temporary and permanent ROW associated with the construction and installation of the proposed pipeline and associated facilities. Types of activities and facilities that are expected to require ground disturbance for this project include construction of the pipeline, the 100-foot permanent ROW, the compressor station, mainline block valves, interconnects, contractor staging areas, contractor yards, and access roads.

Design details for the proposed Project have been continuously evolving at the same time the environmental investigations have been underway. As a result, environmental surveys, including the architectural history survey, were conducted within a 400-foot-wide Study Corridor centered on the Project alignment. The width of the Study Corridor allows for minor modifications to the proposed pipeline route to account for pipeline-related facilities. For the reconnaissance-level historic architectural survey, the direct APE includes all properties intersected by the 400-foot-corridor. The direct APE was extended to entire properties to be inclusive of multiple resources on a property that may share historical or architectural significance. Likewise, the APE was also extended to include adjacent properties that have been subdivided from larger farm properties, but may have been historically associated with properties intersected by the Project alignment.

The indirect APE, or viewshed APE, consists of areas adjacent to the direct APE that may incur visual impacts resulting from the construction of above-ground facilities and removal of vegetation and trees. Where new above-ground facilities (such as compressor stations, mainline block valves, and interconnects) are proposed, the indirect APE was expanded to include properties within a ¼-mile radius.

This approach was presented to the SHPOs in the Project scoping letters for Pennsylvania and New Jersey (included in Appendix G2 [Privileged]) and was accepted by the PHMC on September 10, 2014, and by NJHPO on February 18, 2015.

4.7 Cultural Resources Investigations

Cultural resource field surveys began in August 2014 and continued into August 2015. Archaeological survey was temporarily halted in January 2015 due to snow cover and frozen soil. As of this filing, survey permission has been granted for approximately 73 miles of the 118.1 miles of mainline and laterals. Archaeological survey has been completed along approximately 59 percent of the 400 foot Study Corridor (Appendix 4B). Architectural history survey is based on individual landowner parcels and has been completed on 83 percent of the parcels (Appendix 4C). Survey of the remaining corridor will be completed when survey permission is granted.

4.7.1 Overview Results

The initial phase of investigation involved an overview survey to gather information about previous cultural resource investigations and known archaeological sites within the 400-foot Study Corridor. For historic architectural resources, information was gathered on previously recorded resources within one-quarter mile of the Project corridor inclusive of any properties that may fall within the indirect APE. The information regarding archaeological sites was used to stratify the Project's area into zones of cultural resources sensitivity. Cultural resources sensitivity is defined as the likelihood for pre- or post-contact cultural resources to be present within the Project areas based on different categories of information. The following methodology was used to complete the overview:

- Identification of any known archaeological sites and previously recorded historic architectural properties through background research and state site file searches. Data pertaining to the known sites, including their locational, functional, and temporal characteristics, were reviewed where applicable;
- Review of recent cultural resource management surveys performed in the towns and townships where the proposed Project is located;
- Review of primary and secondary historic information (e.g., maps, atlases, town histories) to learn of areas where previous structures and landscapes were potentially located; and

- Computer modeling based on locations of previously identified sites and environmental parameters to define archaeological sensitivity.

A review of available information was conducted to determine land use history and identify any archeological sites within one mile of the Project corridor or historic architectural properties within one-quarter mile of the Project corridor (see SHPO scoping letters in Appendix G2 [Privileged]). Relevant site files and other documentary sources contained in the PHMC, NJHPO, and New Jersey State Museum (NJSM) files were reviewed. The results of these reviews are tabulated in the archaeological and architectural history survey reports, which are included in Appendix J (Privileged). These reports were submitted to the respective SHPOs and are included in this FERC filing as Appendix J (Privileged).

Archaeological sites within the 400-foot Study Corridor and historic architectural properties within the direct and indirect APEs are those that are most likely to be impacted by the Project. These resources are described and tabulated below.

4.7.1.1 Archaeological and Architectural History Resources Previously Recorded in Pennsylvania

Based on a review of the PHMC’s online Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (CRGIS) and the Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey (PASS), 13 previously recorded archaeological sites were mapped within the Study Corridor in Pennsylvania (Table 4.7-1). The NRHP status of these sites has not been evaluated.

The mapped locations of each of these sites will be tested to determine if the site is present within the Study Corridor. If site presence is confirmed, PennEast will take measures to either avoid the site or conduct additional testing to determine eligibility for the NRHP. If avoidance is feasible, an avoidance and protection plan will be developed and submitted to PHMC for review.

**Table 4.7-1
Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within the 400-Foot Study Corridor in Pennsylvania**

PASS Number	County	Cultural Affiliation \ Site Type	NRHP Status
36LU0103	Luzerne	Prehistoric/Rockshelter	Not Evaluated
36NM0075	Northampton	Prehistoric/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0076	Northampton	Prehistoric: Late and Terminal Archaic/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0088	Northampton	Preshistoric: Late Archaic through Early Woodland/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0089	Northampton	Prehistoric: Late Archaic/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0114	Northampton	Prehistoric/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0156	Northampton	Historic and Prehistoric/No Data	Not Evaluated
36NM0157	Northampton	Prehistoric/Lithic Reduction	Not Evaluated
36NM0221	Northampton	Prehistoric/Open Habitation	Not Evaluated
36NM0294	Northampton	Prehistoric/Open Site Unknown Function	Not Evaluated

**Table 4.7-1
Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within the 400-Foot Study Corridor in Pennsylvania**

PASS Number	County	Cultural Affiliation \ Site Type	NRHP Status
36BU0119	Bucks	Prehistoric/Open Site Unknown Function	Not Evaluated
36BU0120	Bucks	Prehistoric/Open Site Unknown Function	Not Evaluated
36BU0123	Bucks	Prehistoric/Open Site Unknown Function	Not Evaluated

Background research at the PHMC determined that there are 44 previously documented historic architectural resources on properties within one-quarter mile of the Project corridor in Pennsylvania. Of those 44, one is a National Historic Landmark (NHL), five are listed in the NRHP, 12 are eligible for listing in the NRHP, and 13 are not eligible for listing in the NRHP. An additional 13 resources were previously surveyed, but their NRHP eligibility is undetermined. Of the 44 properties, five appear to have been demolished since they were last surveyed. A more detailed description of these resources is provided in Table 4.7-2.

**Table 4.7-2
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor in Pennsylvania**

Mile Post	BHP Key Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
0.1	156670	Hildebrandt Farmstead	Dallas	Luzerne	Undetermined: 9/19/2011
5.6	200508	Lehigh Valley Railroad: West Pittston Branch	West Wyoming	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 9/11/2013
6.0	156166	Delaware Lackawanna and Western Railroad	West Wyoming	Luzerne	Undetermined: 6/22/2010
6.4	000731	Swetland Mansion	Wyoming	Luzerne	NRHP Listed: 12/13/1978
6.5	135853	SR 11 Bridge over Abraham Creek BMS#: 40001106501233	Wyoming	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 3/5/2007
6.5	086551	Crawford House	Wyoming	Luzerne	Undetermined: 1970 (Demolished)
6.6	115265	Wyoming Monument	Wyoming	Luzerne	NRHP Listed: 5/13/2002
6.8	128752	Wikes-Barre Wyoming Valley Airport	Wyoming	Luzerne	Eligible: 7/26/2004

**Table 4.7-2
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor
in Pennsylvania**

Mile Post	BHP Key Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
7.3	097158	Jeremiah Blanchard House	Jenkins	Luzerne	Undetermined: 12/17/1990 (Demolished)
7.3 11.8 16.8 71.1	156109	Lehigh Valley Railroad	Jenkins	Luzerne, Northampton	Undetermined: 6/22/2010
7.3	155624	Erie and Wyoming Valley Railroad	Jenkins	Luzerne	Undetermined: 6/22/2010
7.2	126031	Port Blanchard Village	Jenkins	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 9/24/2003
9.4	155754	Central Railroad of New Jersey	Plains	Luzerne, Northampton	Undetermined: 6/22/2010
13.2	155199	Pennsylvania Turnpike: Northeast Extension	Bear Creek	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 4/7/2005
19.6	135660	SR 115 Bridge BMS#: 40011501200000	Bear Creek	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 3/5/2007
19.6	092636	SR 115 Bridge over Shades Creek	Bear Creek	Luzerne	Not Eligible: 7/1/1983
50.5	144291	Appalachian Trail	Lower Towamensing	Carbon, Northampton	Eligible: 4/11/2008
53.7 60.2 62.8	156534	Lehigh and New England Railroad	Moore	Northampton	Undetermined: 5/26/2011
57.0	156601	Pennsylvania - New Jersey (PNJ) Interconnection	Moore	Northampton	Eligible: 8/29/2011
56.9	157176	Fehnel Farm	Moore	Northampton	Eligible: 2/11/2013
60.2	102488	Lehigh and New England RR (Bethlehem to Chapmanboro)	Moore	Northampton	Eligible: 9/22/1994

**Table 4.7-2
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor
in Pennsylvania**

Mile Post	BHP Key Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
60.3	137023	Stone Post Road Bridge over Monocacy Creek BMS#: 48720404899186	Moore	Northampton	Not Eligible: 3/5/2007
67.7	101075	Walter Farm	Bethlehem	Northampton	Not Eligible: 2/1/1993
67.7	136992	Country Club Road Bridge over SR 22 BMS#: 48002201501746	Bethlehem	Northampton	Not Eligible: 3/05/2007
68.9	097548	Melvin and Doris Hartz House	Bethlehem	Northampton	Eligible: 11/07/1991
68.9	097547	Wayne and Nancy Misner Property	Bethlehem	Northampton	Not Eligible: 11/7/1997
69.2	096314	Koch Farm	Bethlehem	Northampton	Undetermined: 1/30/1989
70.0	096315	D. Bayer Farm	Bethlehem	Northampton	Eligible: 5/7/1990 (Demolished)
70.0	143129	Petie, Inc. Property	Bethlehem	Northampton	Not Eligible: 11/28/2006 (Demolished)
70.3	155212	George Emrick Farm	Bethlehem	Northampton	Undetermined: 2008 (Demolished)
71.1	096309	Hopeville Historic District	Bethlehem	Northampton	Eligible: 11/14/1989
71.0	001016	Lehigh Canal Easton Section	Bethlehem	Northampton	NRHP Listed: 10/02/1978
71.1	096308	Redington Steel Works: Proving Ground	Bethlehem	Northampton	Eligible: 5/7/1990
71.7 HL 0.1	086688	Site No. 3: Farmhouse, Barn and Outbuildings	Lower Saucon	Northampton	Eligible: 9/17/1996
71.6 HL 0.0	086674	Limekiln	Lower Saucon	Northampton	Undetermined: 1972

**Table 4.7-2
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor
in Pennsylvania**

Mile Post	BHP Key Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
HL 1.1	101330	Severn Homestead	Lower Saucon	Northampton	Not Eligible: 3/8/1993
71.7	096307	Anthony Oberly Farm	Lower Saucon	Northampton	Eligible: 11/14/1989
72.0	143013	Christman Farm; Pichel Farm	Lower Saucon	Northampton	Eligible: 8/21/2006
74.5	123914	Isaac Stout House	Williams	Bucks	NRHP Listed: 8/11/2004
74.6	000223	SR 2003 Bridge over Frey's Run	Williams	Bucks	NRHP Listed: 6/26/1988
	137149	BMS#: 482000070006384			
75.9	086672	Bachman-Ivenz House	Williams	Bucks	Undetermined: ND
76.0	098081	1215 County Line	Durham	Bucks	Undetermined: 1992
77.6	087294	River Road	Riegelsville	Bucks	Not Eligible: 3/5/2007
77.6	001661	Delaware Division of the Pennsylvania Canal	Riegelsville	Bucks	NRHP Listed: 10/24/1974 NHL Listed: 12/8/1976 Eligible: 4/12/2002

4.7.1.2 Archaeological and Architectural History Resources Previously Recorded in New Jersey

Based on review of records filed with the New Jersey State Museum, six previously recorded archaeological sites were mapped within the 400-foot Study Corridor in New Jersey (Table 4.7-3). The NRHP status of these six sites has not been evaluated. The mapped location of all six sites is in Hunterdon County.

The mapped locations of each of these sites will be tested to determine if the site is present within the Study Corridor. If site presence is confirmed, PennEast will take measures to either avoid the site or conduct additional testing to determine eligibility for the NRHP. If avoidance is feasible, an avoidance and protection plan will be developed and submitted to PHMC for review.

**Table 4.7-3
Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within the 400-Foot Study Corridor in
New Jersey**

NJSM Site Number	County	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	NRHP Status
28HU358A	Hunterdon	Prehistoric: No data	Not Evaluated
28HU378	Hunterdon	Prehistoric: No data	Not Evaluated
28HU381	Hunterdon	Prehistoric: No data	Not Evaluated
28HU394	Hunterdon	Prehistoric: No data	Not Evaluated
28HU573	Hunterdon	Historic: 19th-Century Stone Foundation Remains and Artifact Scatter	Not Evaluated
28HU574	Hunterdon	Historic: 19th- and/or 20th-Century Stone Foundation Remains	Not Evaluated

Background research at NJHPO determined that there are 18 previously documented historic architectural resources within one-quarter-mile of the Project corridor in New Jersey. Of those 18, six are listed in the NRHP and nine are eligible for listing in the NRHP. An additional three properties were previously identified, but their NRHP eligibility was not assessed. Of the 18 resources, one has been demolished. A more detailed description of these resources is provided in Table 4.7-4.

**Table 4.7-4
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor
in New Jersey**

Mile Post	NJHPO ID Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
78.0	1598	Pursley's Ferry Historic District	Holland	Hunterdon	NRHP Listed: 10/8/1980 SRHP Listed: 7/12/1978
82.3	4275	Bunns Valley Agricultural Historic District	Holland	Hunterdon	Eligible: 5/3/2004
83.3	3767	Javes Road Bridge	Holland	Hunterdon	Eligible: 2/11/1999
91.9	2293	Edward Fox House and Farm	Kingwood	Hunterdon	Eligible: 9/14/2012 (DEMOLISHED)
92.2	8004	George Fox (IV)-John Phillips-David Pittenger House	Kingwood	Hunterdon	Identified: 4/27/2012
95.9	4591	Rosemont Rural Agricultural Historic District	Delaware	Hunterdon	NRHP Listed: 6/18/2010 SRHP Listed: 2/10/2010

**Table 4.7-4
Previously Recorded Historic Architectural Resources within 1/4 Mile of the Project Corridor
in New Jersey**

Mile Post	NJHPO ID Number	Resource Name	Municipality	County	NRHP Status
100.4 LL 0.0	1914	Inch Lines Linear Multistate Historic District	West Amwell	Hunterdon	Eligible: 8/31/1993
LL1.4	1641	Mount Airy Historic District	West Amwell	Hunterdon	NRHP Listed:11/13/1989 SRHP Listed:9/14/1989
105.3	1698	Pleasant Valley Historic District	Hopewell	Mercer	NRHP Listed: 6/14/1991 SRHP Listed: 4/12/1991
105.9	1697	Phillips Farm (Howell Living Historical Farm)	Hopewell	Mercer	NRHP Listed: 5/2/1977 SRHP Listed: 12/1/1976
108.6	4412	Atchley Farmstead	Hopewell	Mercer	Identified: ND
110.7	6726	Hart's Corner Schoolhouse	Hopewell	Mercer	Identified: ND
110.8	6355	Hart/Hoch House	Hopewell	Mercer	NRHP Listed: 3/14/1973 SRHP Listed: 7/8/1972
110.8	4750	Oldis (Smith-Mershon) Farm	Hopewell	Mercer	Eligible: 5/17/2004
111.8	4540	Delaware & Bound Brook RR Historic District	Hopewell	Mercer	Eligible: 9/9/2005
112.6	4993	NJ Route 31 Circle (Pennington Circle)	Hopewell	Mercer	Eligible: 9/21/2010
113.5	1676	Joseph P. Blackwell Farm	Hopewell	Mercer	Eligible: 6/23/1982
113.7	2932	Adams House	Hopewell	Mercer	Eligible: 6/23/1982

4.7.2 Archaeological Survey Results

4.7.2.1 Research Methods

The following methods were used in the surveys conducted to date, and will be employed in surveys to be conducted when access permissions are obtained for the remainder of the properties along the

pipeline corridor. In Pennsylvania, the archaeological survey followed the guidelines established in Cultural Resource Management in Pennsylvania: Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations (PHMC 2008). In New Jersey, the archaeological survey followed the guidelines established in Guidelines for Phase I Archaeological Investigations: Identification of Archaeological Resources (HPO 2004). Where survey permission was granted, the Study Corridor in both states was subject to a thorough pedestrian survey to define above-ground indicators of archaeological sites such as rockshelters, standing structures, or foundations regardless of field conditions (i.e., steep slopes, standing water).

Based on analysis of previous archaeological surveys conducted in proximity to the Project area and a geographic information system (GIS) based sensitivity model, relatively level landforms within approximately 300 feet (in Pennsylvania) or 500 feet (in New Jersey) of perennial water sources and similar settings adjacent to previously recorded archaeological sites were categorized as having a high probability for the presence of archaeological sites. In addition, areas in proximity to structure locations indicated on historic maps were also categorized as high probability areas. Areas of moderate probability encompassed level to gently sloping landforms between approximately 300 and 600 feet (in Pennsylvania) and 500 and 600 feet (in New Jersey) from a perennial water source. Areas with a low probability to contain archaeological sites include areas of steeper slope (≥ 15 percent) and areas at more than 600 feet distant from perennial water sources.

In Pennsylvania, portions of the Study Corridor where soil visibility was greater than 70 percent (that is, where there was no crop or other vegetative cover, except in areas of no-till agriculture), systematic inspection of the surface for artifacts was conducted along transects spaced at 10-foot intervals in high probability areas. Surface survey transects in areas of medium and low sensitivity were spaced at 20-foot intervals. In upland settings where archaeological sites were restricted to the upper three feet of the soil column, shovel test pits (STPs) were excavated at 50-foot intervals in high probability zones and at 100-foot intervals in moderate probability zones.

In New Jersey, in portions of the Study Corridor where soil visibility was greater than 50 percent (that is, where there was no crop or other vegetative cover, except in areas of no-till agriculture), systematic inspection of the surface for artifacts was conducted in conjunction with widely spaced subsurface probing sufficient to characterize the nature of the soils and establish the depth of Holocene sediments. If it was determined that Holocene sediments extended below the plow zone, a regular program of subsurface testing was initiated. In high and moderate probability areas the systematic inspection occurred along transects spaced at 10-foot intervals. Surface survey transects in areas of low probability were spaced at 20-foot intervals. Artifacts noted during surface survey were point plotted and collected for processing and analysis. Surface conditions were documented photographically, and the locations where surface survey was employed were indicated on the report mapping. Subsurface testing in high and moderate probability areas was accomplished by STPs excavated at 50-foot intervals on landforms where archaeological sites can be demonstrated to occur within one meter of the surface.

In both states, in high and medium probability zones where archaeological sites may be present below three feet, typically on the terraces and floodplains of the largest streams crossed by the Project, test units (TUs) measuring three-feet-square or larger will be excavated at 100-foot intervals. Geomorphological investigations will be conducted at selected stream crossings within the 400-foot Study Corridor to determine if archaeological sites may be present below three feet. Subsurface testing was, in general, not conducted on excessive slopes (≥ 15 percent slope) or in areas of standing water. As noted above, these settings were visually inspected for the presence of above-ground indications of archaeological sites. If evidence of these features was identified in areas of excessive slope or standing water, subsurface testing was conducted on a judgmental basis.

The results of the field studies are included in survey reports that were submitted to the PHMC and NJHPO concurrently with this Resource Report. PHMC and NJHPO comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these resources are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC. The reports are included as Appendix J (Privileged). Additional surveys will be conducted when survey permissions are granted; the results of the additional surveys will be documented in addendum reports that will be submitted to the SHPOs for review and comment. All addendum reports and agency comments on them will be filed with FERC.

4.7.2.2 Archaeological Survey in Pennsylvania

Field surveys were conducted between August 2014 and July 2015. Of the 13 previously identified archaeological sites that are mapped as intersecting the 400-foot Study Corridor, three have been investigated to date: 36LU0111, 36NM0075, and 36NM0114. Testing did not reveal evidence of these sites within the Study Corridor. Twelve archaeological resources (eight archaeological sites, four isolated finds) were identified within the permanent or temporary ROW. These resources are summarized in Table 4.7-5. Nine of these resources (36LU/050, 36NM0324, 36NM0337, 36NM0338, 36NM0339, 36NM0342, 36NM/168, 36NM/169, and 36BU/103) are recommended as not eligible for listing in the NRHP; therefore, no further work is recommended for these nine resources. One resource (36NM0330) appears to be a portion of a larger archaeological site that is adjacent to the ROW. PennEast recommends that the portion of this site that is within the ROW is not likely to contribute to the eligibility of the larger site, and that no further investigation of the portion of this site within the ROW is needed. The portion of 36NM0330 that is adjacent to the ROW is potentially NRHP eligible; thus, PennEast recommends that it be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during constructions, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to it. Two of the resources (36CR0149, 36NM0328) are located within the ROW and are recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. PennEast will perform Phase II evaluations to determine their NRHP-eligibility and will coordinate as required with the PHMC. The archaeological survey report that discusses these 12 archaeological resources and PennEast's recommended actions for these resources, and an avoidance plan for 36NM0330 is included in Appendix J (Privileged). The archaeological survey report has been submitted to the PHMC concurrently with this resource report. The PHMC comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these sites are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

**Table 4.7-5
Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania**

PASS Number	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	Recommended NRHP Status	Recommended Action	Agency Comments
36LU/050	Prehistoric: Late Archaic\Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36CR0149	Prehistoric: Terminal Archaic, Late Woodland\Unknown	Potentially Eligible	Phase II NRHP evaluation	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0324	Historic: 20 th c.\ Domestic	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0328	Prehistoric\ Unknown	Potentially Eligible	Phase II NRHP evaluation	Anticipated October 2015

**Table 4.7-5
Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in
Pennsylvania**

PASS Number	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	Recommended NRHP Status	Recommended Action	Agency Comments
36NM0337	Prehistoric\ Unknown	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0338	Prehistoric\ Unknown	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0339	Historic: Late 19 th through Mid-20 th c.\ Refuse Deposit	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0342	Historic\ Domestic	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM/168	Prehistoric\ Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0330	Prehistoric\ Unknown	Portion within ROW does not contribute to NRHP eligibility of the larger site	No further work or avoidance of portion within ROW. Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor portion of site outside of and adjacent to ROW	Anticipated October 2015
36NM/169	Prehistoric\ Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36BU/103	Prehistoric\ Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015

Seven additional archaeological resources (six archaeological sites, one isolated find) were identified within the Study Corridor that are adjacent to the permanent or temporary ROW and are summarized in Table 4.7-6. Two of these resources (36NM/170, 36LU0330) are recommended as not eligible for listing in the NRHP; therefore, no further work or avoidance is recommended for these resources. The NRHP eligibility of five resources (CEMLU0008, 36NM0336, 36NM0327, 36NM343, and 36NM0329) has not been evaluated, but they are recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. They are adjacent to the ROW; thus, PennEast recommends that they be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to them. The archaeological survey report that discusses these seven archaeological resources, PennEast's recommended actions for these resources, and an avoidance plan for the five potentially NRHP-eligible resources is in Appendix J (Privileged). The archaeological survey report has been submitted to the PHMC concurrently with this resource report. The PHMC comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these resources are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

**Table 4.7-6
Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW in Pennsylvania**

PASS Number	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	Recommended NRHP Status	Recommended Action	Agency Comments
36LU0330	Historic: 19th c.\ Barn	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
CEMLU0008	Historic\Cemetery	Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
36NM/170	Prehistoric\Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0336	Prehistoric: Middle Archaic, Late Woodland\Unknown	Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0327	Historic: 19 th c.\ Industrial	Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0343	Prehistoric\ Unknown	Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
36NM0329	Prehistoric: Late Woodland\Unknown	Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015

4.7.2.3 Archaeological Survey in New Jersey

Field surveys in New Jersey were conducted between January and July 2015. Of the six previously identified archaeological sites mapped as intersecting the 400-foot Study Corridor, two have been investigated to date: 28HU378 and 28HU381. Testing did not reveal evidence of either site within the Study Corridor. Eight previously unrecorded archaeological resources (four archaeological sites and four isolated finds) were identified within permanent or temporary ROW and associated workspaces (Table 4.7-7). Five of the resources (PE-Me35-S1, PE-Hu43-IF1, PE-Me25-IF1, PE-Me35-IF1, and PE-Me35-IF4) are recommended as not eligible for listing in the NRHP; therefore, no further work is recommended for these five resources. One of these resources (28ME386) is potentially eligible, but PennEast recommends that the portion of the site within the ROW does not contribute to potential significance of the overall site, and that no further investigation of the portion within the ROW is needed. Since the portion of this site that falls outside the ROW is potentially NRHP eligible, PennEast recommends that it be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to it. The remaining two resources (28HU577 and PE-Me27-S1) are recommended as potentially eligible for the NRHP. PennEast will perform Phase II evaluations to determine their NRHP-eligibility and

will coordinate with NJHPO. The archaeological survey report that discusses these eight archaeological resources, PennEast’s recommended actions for these resources, and an avoidance plan for site 28ME386 is in Appendix J (Privileged). The archaeological survey report has been submitted to the NJHPO concurrently with this resource report. NJHPO comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these sites are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

**Table 4.7-7
Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Permanent or Temporary ROW in New Jersey**

Identification Number ^a	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	Recommended NRHP Status	Recommended Action	Agency Comments
PE-Hu43-IF1	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
28HU577	Historic/Quarry	Potentially Eligible	Phase II NRHP evaluation	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me25-IF1	Historic/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me27-S1	Historic/Refuse Dump within Pleasant Valley Historic District/Phillips Mill Site	Pleasant Valley Historic District/Phillips Mill Site NRHP Listed; Archaeological Component Potentially Eligible	Phase II NRHP evaluation, assessment of contributing status	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me35-S1	Historic/Field Scatter	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
28ME386	Historic/Joseph P. Blackwell Farm (NJHPO ID 1676)	Joseph P. Blackwell Farm Individually Eligible; Archaeological Component Potentially Eligible	No further work or avoidance of portion within ROW. Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor portion of site outside of ROW	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me35-IF1	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me35-IF4	Historic/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015

^a New Jersey site numbers issued by the NJSM begin with 28. Field numbers begin with PE. Resources with field numbers do not meet the NJSM criteria for a site and were therefore not assigned a New Jersey site number.

Nine additional archaeological resources (three archaeological sites and six isolated finds) were identified within the Study Corridor that are adjacent to the permanent or temporary ROW and are summarized in Table 4.7-8. The seven isolated finds (PE-Hu42-IF1, PE-Hu43-IF2, PE-Hu97-IF1, PE-Hu97-IF2, PE-Me26-IF1, PE-Me35-IF2, and PE-Me35-IF3) are not NRHP eligible, and no further work is recommended for these resources. The NRHP eligibility of the remaining two resources (28HU578 and 28HU579) has not been evaluated, but they are recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. They are adjacent to the ROW, and PennEast therefore recommends that

they be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to them. The archaeological survey report that discusses these nine archaeological resources, PennEast’s recommended actions for these resources, and an avoidance plan for the two potentially NRHP-eligible resources is in Appendix J (Privileged). The archaeological survey report has been submitted to the NJHPO concurrently with this resource report. NJHPO comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these resources are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

**Table 4.7-8
Newly Identified Archaeological Resources Adjacent to the Permanent or Temporary ROW
in New Jersey**

Identification Number ^a	Cultural Affiliation\ Site Type	Recommended NRHP Status	Recommended Action	Agency Comments
PE-Hu42-IF1	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Hu43-IF1	Historic/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
28HU579	Historic/Foundation and Artifact Scatter; Prehistoric/Lithic Scatter	Not Evaluated, Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
28HU578	Prehistoric/Lithic Scatter	Not Evaluated, Potentially Eligible	Mark on construction plans, fence and monitor during construction	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Hu97-IF2	Prehistoric/ Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Hu97-IF1	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me26-IF1	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me35-IF2	Prehistoric/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015
PE-Me35-IF3	Historic/Isolated Find	Not Eligible	No further investigation or avoidance needed	Anticipated October 2015

^a New Jersey site numbers issued by the NJSM begin with 28. Field numbers begin with PE. Resources with field numbers do not meet the NJSM criteria for a site and were therefore not assigned a New Jersey site number.

The archaeological survey report discussing the 17 newly identified archaeological resources and recommended actions for these resources was submitted to the NJHPO concurrently with this Resource Report. NJHPO comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these resources are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

4.7.3 Architectural History Survey Results

4.7.3.1 Research Methods

In preparation for the field survey effort, background research was conducted at the SHPOs to determine the location of previously identified historic architectural resources within the Project area. Historic architectural resources include buildings, structures, objects, landscapes and districts over 48 years of age. While 50 years of age is the typical age threshold set by the NRHP, the threshold for this project was set at 48 years (constructed in or before 1967) to account for a 2017 Project construction. For historic architectural resources in Pennsylvania, the PHMC's online Cultural Resource Geographic Information System (CRGIS) was consulted to gather preliminary information on previously documented resources within a one-quarter-mile study area that are listed in, eligible for listing in, or not eligible for listing in the NRHP (see SHPO scoping letters in Appendix G2 [Privileged]). Data was also gathered on previously documented resources that were previously identified, but their NRHP eligibility was undetermined. Consultation of the online site was followed by background research at the PHMC in July and September 2014 to gather files on the resources identified in CRGIS and others that may not have been listed in the online database. Additional desktop studies included a review of the historic contexts developed by the PHMC for their *Pennsylvania Agricultural History Project* to become familiar with the agricultural contexts and correlating property types within the Project area.

Similar research was conducted for historic architectural resources in New Jersey. First, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's interactive web mapping application, NJ-GeoWeb, was consulted to gather preliminary information on previously documented properties and districts within a one-quarter-mile study area in New Jersey (see SHPO scoping letters in Appendix G2 [Privileged]). Data were gathered on resources that are listed in and eligible for listing in the NRHP, and on resources that have been identified, but not evaluated for NRHP eligibility. Following the online research, background research was conducted at the NJHPO in July 2014 and December 2014 to gather files on the resources identified in NJ-GeoWeb and others that may not have been listed in the online database. The results of that data gathering effort are discussed in the following section.

Research was also conducted online to determine the potential presence of previously unidentified historic architectural resources over 48 years of age in the Project area. Architectural historians consulted local and regional studies, historic maps and atlases, historic and current aerial photographs, and tax parcel information to develop an understanding of the Project area and identify potential historic architectural resources to be investigated during the field survey effort. All pertinent information captured during the background research phase was recorded in a spreadsheet and was plotted on a large-scale map set to help guide the field survey effort.

4.7.3.2 Architectural History Survey in Pennsylvania

Architectural historians that meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards and have prior working experience in Pennsylvania conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey of properties that have the potential to be affected by the Project. Survey was conducted on properties intersected by a 400-foot Study Corridor and limited to properties where access was granted. The 400-foot Study Corridor was established early in the Project process as a way to allow for minor modifications to the alignment. The location and design of other associated features such as compressor stations, mainline valves, interconnects, staging areas, yards, and access roads have been undergoing development concurrent with field investigations. The historic architectural survey has been undertaken where possible, but additional survey and analysis will be required as the locations and design of these support facilities are finalized and access to the properties are granted.

The goal of the survey was to locate and document previously documented resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP and identify and document previously undocumented resources over 48 years of age that are potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. The first phase of survey was conducted from the road to capture resources that were visible from public ROW and did not require property access. Properties that were not visible from the road and had granted access were accessed and surveyed during the second phase of survey. For NRHP-listed and eligible resources that were documented within the last 10 years, survey consisted of taking photographs, plotting the location, and noting any physical or contextual changes to the resources since they were last documented. NRHP-listed and eligible resources that were documented more than 10 years ago were surveyed using the same methodology that was used for newly identified resources (see below). Previously identified resources that had an “undetermined” eligibility status, were surveyed using the same methodology as newly identified resources.

Newly identified architectural resources were documented with high resolution digital photography, plotted on maps, and descriptive information about the physical condition and contextual setting was noted while in the field. Preliminary site plans were prepared in the field for agricultural properties with multiple resources. Field survey was conducted according to the PHMC’s *Guidelines for Architectural Investigations* in Pennsylvania.

To date, the reconnaissance-level field survey in Pennsylvania has documented 86 properties in the APE that contain architectural resources over 48 years of age (see Table 4D-1 in Appendix 4D). The PHMC Abbreviated Historic Resource Survey Forms (Abbreviated HRSFs) were completed for newly identified resources and for previously identified resources with an “undetermined” eligibility status. Properties that have lost a substantial amount of integrity and appear “clearly not eligible” are recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP on the Abbreviated HRSFs (see Table 4D-1 in Appendix 4D). Properties that have lost a minimal to moderate amount of integrity, but will require additional research to fully evaluate their significance, will be recommended for intensive-level survey and documentation on standard PHMC Historic Resource Survey Forms (HRSFs). These are noted in Table 4D-1 as “Needs Additional Research.” Properties that appear to retain a good deal of integrity, but will require additional research to fully evaluate their significance, will also be recommended for intensive-level survey and documentation on standard PHMC HRSFs. These are noted in Table 4D-1 as “Recommended Eligible Needs Additional Research.” Of the 86 newly identified resources in Pennsylvania, 59 are recommended not eligible, nine are recommended eligible (and need additional research), and 17 need additional research to assess their eligibility. One resource is NRHP-listed, but because it was last evaluated more than 10 years ago, it was resurveyed and recommended eligible (NO-0046). Of the nine recommended eligible is a resource that was previously surveyed, but because it was never evaluated for NRHP eligibility, it was surveyed and evaluated for this study (BU-0040). It is recommended that standard HRSF forms be completed for all properties noted as needing additional research (see Table 4D-1 in Appendix 4D for a more detailed description of the newly identified resources). The Reconnaissance-Level Historic Architectural Survey Report and accompanying Abbreviated HRSFs have been submitted to the PHMC for review and comment and are attached in Appendix J. Once the PHMC makes final determinations on eligibility status of historic architectural resources in the APE, PennEast will assess the potential for the project to cause effects to all NRHP-listed and eligible resources. If ongoing studies and consultation with the PHMC determine that the project will cause adverse effects to historic properties, efforts will be made to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those adverse effects.

4.7.3.3 Architectural History Survey in New Jersey

Architectural historians that meet the Secretary of the Interior’s professional qualification standards also conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey of properties in New Jersey that have the potential to be affected by the proposed Project. As in Pennsylvania, survey in New Jersey was conducted on

properties intersected by the 400-foot corridor and where access was granted. As in Pennsylvania, additional survey and analysis will be required as the locations and design of support facilities are finalized and access to the properties are granted.

The goal of the survey was to locate and document previously documented resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP and identify and document previously undocumented resources over 48 years of age that are potentially eligible for listing in the SRHP and NRHP. The first phase of survey was conducted from the road to capture resources that were visible from public ROW and did not require property access. Properties that were not visible from the road and had granted access were accessed and surveyed during the second phase of survey. For SRHP/NRHP-listed and eligible resources that were documented within the last 10 years, survey consisted of taking photographs, plotting the location, and noting any physical or contextual changes to the resources since they were last documented. SRHP/NRHP-listed and eligible resources that were documented more than 10 years ago were surveyed using the same methodology that was used for newly identified resources (see below). Previously identified resources that had no SRHP/NRHP eligibility determination (noted as “identified” in Table 4.7-4), were surveyed using the same methodology as newly identified resources.

Newly identified architectural resources were documented with high resolution digital photography, plotted on maps, and descriptive information about the physical condition and contextual setting was noted while in the field. Preliminary site plans were prepared for agricultural properties with multiple resources in the field. Field survey was conducted according to NJHPO’s *Guidelines for Architectural Survey*.

To date, the reconnaissance-level field survey in New Jersey has documented 41 properties that contain architectural resources over 48 years of age (see Table 4D-2 in Appendix 4D). NJHPO Base Forms were completed for newly identified resources and for previously identified resources with no eligibility determination (noted as “identified in Table 4.7-4). Properties that appear “clearly not eligible” are recommended not eligible for listing in the SRHP or NRHP. Properties that have lost a substantial amount of integrity and appear “clearly not eligible” are recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP on the NJHPO Base Forms (see Table 4D-2 in Appendix 4D). Properties that have lost a minimal to moderate amount of integrity, but will require additional research to fully evaluate their significance, will be recommended for intensive-level survey and documentation on full NJHPO Inventory Forms with the appropriate attachments. These are noted in Table 4D-2 as “Needs Additional Research.” Properties that appear to retain a good deal of integrity, but will require additional research to fully evaluate their significance, will also be recommended for intensive-level survey and documentation on full NJHPO Inventory Forms. These are noted in Table 4D-2 as “Recommended Eligible Needs Additional Research.” Of the 41 newly identified resources in New Jersey, 27 are recommended not eligible, seven are recommended eligible (and need additional research), and seven need additional research to assess their eligibility. Of the 41 resources, eleven were previously identified, but were resurveyed and evaluated during this investigation:

- HU-0070
- HU-0075
- HU-0095
- HU-0148
- ME-0170
- ME-0172
- ME-0190
- HU -0191
- ME-0209
- HU-0210
- ME-0218

It is recommended that full NJHPO Inventory Forms be completed for all properties noted as recommended eligible and as needing additional research (see Table 4D-2 in Appendix 4D for a more detailed description of the newly identified resources). The Reconnaissance-Level Historic Architectural Survey Report and accompanying NJHPO Base Forms have been submitted to NJHPO for review and comment and are attached in Appendix J. Once NJHPO makes final determinations on eligibility status of historic architectural resources in the APE, PennEast will assess the potential for the project to cause effects to all NRHP-listed and eligible resources. If ongoing studies and consultation with NJHPO determine that the project will cause adverse effects to historic properties, efforts will be made to avoid, minimize, or mitigate those adverse effects.

4.8 Outstanding Surveys

The status of identification-level cultural resource surveys for the Project facilities are shown in Table 4.8-1. Archaeological survey of approximately 41 percent of the Project corridor remains to be done and architectural history survey of 17 percent of the Project corridor. Maps in Appendix 4B (archaeology) and Appendix 4C (architectural history) show the locations of the areas that remain to be surveyed. The table in Appendix 4E lists by milepost the areas where landowners have denied survey access. In addition, surveys will be conducted on any off-site mitigation areas once their locations have been determined.

Table 4.8-1
Summary of Completion Status of Cultural Resources Surveys

Project Facility	Survey Type	Survey Status	Anticipated Completion Date	Agency Comments
Pipeline, PA	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Pipeline, NJ	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Pipeline, PA	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Pipeline, NJ	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Hellertown Lateral, PA	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Hellertown Lateral, PA	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Gilbert Lateral, NJ	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Gilbert Lateral, NJ	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Lambertville Lateral, NJ	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Lambertville Lateral, NJ	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Compressor Station, PA	Archaeology	Complete		
Compressor Station, PA	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Access Roads, PA	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Access Roads, NJ	Archaeology	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Access Roads, PA	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016
Access Roads, NJ	Architectural History	Incomplete	November 2015 for parcels with access permission; TBD per landowner permission on remainder	Anticipated January 2016

4.9 Summary

PennEast has completed archaeological survey of 59 percent of the Project corridor and architectural history survey of 83 percent of the properties along the Project corridor. Reporting of the surveys and their results have been submitted to the SHPOs and are filed with FERC in Appendix J (Privileged); SHPO comments are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

4.9.1 Pennsylvania

Between August 2014 and July 2015, 12 new archaeological resources were identified within permanent or temporary ROW and associated workspaces, and seven were identified within the Study Corridor, but outside the ROW, in Pennsylvania. Eleven of these resources are recommended as not eligible for listing on the NRHP, and no further work is recommended for these resources. A portion of one resource that is within the ROW is recommended as unlikely to contribute to the NRHP eligibility of the resource as a whole, most of which is located adjacent to the ROW. Therefore, PennEast recommends no further work for the portion of this resource within the ROW, but that the portion of the resource adjacent to the ROW be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to this resource. Seven resources are recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Of these seven resources, five are outside the ROW, and PennEast recommends that they be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage. Two of these seven resources are within the permanent or temporary ROW, and PennEast will perform Phase II evaluations to determine the NRHP-eligibility of these sites. The archaeological survey report discussing these 19 resources has been submitted to the PHMC concurrently with this resource report. The PHMC comments regarding the NRHP eligibility and recommended actions for these resources are anticipated in October 2015, at which time they will be filed with FERC.

Of the 13 previously identified archaeological sites that are mapped as intersecting the 400-foot Study Corridor, three have been investigated; no evidence of these sites was recovered within the Study Corridor. The mapped locations of the remaining 10 sites will be tested to determine if the site is present within the Study Corridor. If site presence is confirmed, PennEast will take measures to either avoid the site or conduct additional testing to determine eligibility for the NRHP. If avoidance is feasible, an avoidance and protection plan will be developed and submitted to PHMC for review. Additional archaeological survey will need to be completed in 2015 on the remaining parcels to which access is granted.

Between August 2014 and August 2015, 86 newly identified historic architectural resources were documented in Pennsylvania on properties that contain architectural resources over 48 years of age. Of these, 59 are recommended not eligible, ten are recommended eligible (including one NRHP-listed resource that was resurveyed), and it is recommended that additional research be conducted on 17 properties through completion of intensive-level survey and a standard HRSF.

4.9.2 New Jersey

Between January and July 2015, eight new archaeological resources were identified within permanent or temporary ROW and associated workspaces, and nine within the Study Corridor, but outside the ROW, in New Jersey. Twelve of these resources are recommended as not eligible for listing on the NRHP, and no further work is recommended for these resources. Five of these resources are recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Of these, two are outside the ROW and

PennEast recommends that they be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage. A portion of one resource that is within the ROW is recommended as unlikely to contribute to the NRHP eligibility of the resource as a whole, most of which is located outside the ROW. Therefore, PennEast recommends no further work for the portion of this resource within the ROW, but that the portion of the resource adjacent to the ROW be marked on construction plans, fenced with high-visibility orange fencing during construction, and monitored during construction to prevent unintentional damage to this resource. The remaining two resources are within the permanent or temporary ROW, and PennEast will perform Phase II evaluations to determine the NRHP-eligibility of these sites if they cannot be avoided and will coordinate with NJHPO.

Of the six previously identified archaeological sites mapped as intersecting the 400-foot Study Corridor, two have been investigated, but no evidence of either site was recovered within the Study Corridor. Additional archaeological survey will need to be completed in 2015 on the remaining parcels to which access is granted.

Between August 2014 and August 2015, 41 newly identified historic architectural resources were documented in New Jersey on properties that contain architectural resources over 48 years of age. Of these, 27 are recommended not eligible, seven are recommended eligible, and seven resources are recommended for additional research.

4.10 Cumulative Impacts

A cumulative impact analysis is being conducted to identify and describe the potential effects attributable to the proposed PennEast Project. The cumulative impact analysis was developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines (CEQ, 1979) based on recent court rulings. CEQ's regulations define cumulative impacts as the incremental effect of a proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR, Section 1508.7). Although the individual impact of each separate project may be minor, the additive or synergistic effects of multiple projects may be significant. The results and methodology of the cumulative impact analysis can be found in Resource Report 1, Section 1.4. The analysis suggests a Cumulative Impacts Analysis Area of 0.25 miles from the Project for cultural resources.

Potential cumulative impacts may include effects to cultural resources. For federal undertakings such as the current Project, cumulative impacts to cultural resources can be minimized through implementation of Section 106 of the NHPA. For state-funded or permitted projects in Pennsylvania, cumulative impacts to cultural resources can be minimized through the Pennsylvania History Code (37 Pa. Cons. Stat., Section 500). For state-funded or permitted projects in New Jersey, the Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7A) can be used to reduce cumulative impacts to cultural resources.

The Project was designed to avoid or minimize impacts to cultural resources wherever possible. PennEast has co-located the construction ROW adjacent to or in proximity to existing ROWs (e.g., gas pipeline, transmission line, or product pipeline) to the greatest extent practical. Approximately 43.1 miles or 36 percent of the total length of the pipeline is proposed to be co-located with existing utility ROWs, thereby minimizing cumulative effects.

PennEast is currently identifying archaeological and historic architectural resources within the direct and indirect APE and making recommendations to the PHMC and NJSHPO regarding their eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Avoidance of NRHP-listed or eligible properties, as well as assessment and

mitigation of effects to NRHP-listed or eligible properties, will reduce potential cumulative effects to cultural resources.

4.11 References

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1979. Memorandum for NEPA Liaisons. Agency Implementing Procedures Under CEQ's NEPA Regulations. Washington, DC. January 19, 1979.

Marcellus Gas. 2015. Information Related to Pennsylvania Deep Gas Well Activity. Available at: <https://www.marcellusgas.org/index.php>. [Select County]. Accessed on February 9, 2015.

New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO). 2004. Guidelines for Architectural Survey. Available online at: <http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/1identify/survarchit.htm>.

New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJHPO). 2004. Guidelines for Phase I Archaeological Investigations: Identification of Archaeological Resources. Available online at: <http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/1identify/arkeoguide1.htm>.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). 2008. Cultural Resource Management in Pennsylvania: Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations. Available online at: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/historic_preservation/3741/forms_and_guidance/418107#target3.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). 2014. Guidelines for Architectural Investigations. Available online at: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/historic_preservation/3741/forms_and_guidance/418107#target2.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC). 2013. Survey Guidelines for Pipeline Projects – Above Ground Resources June 2013. Available online at: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/historic_preservation/3741/forms_and_guidance/418107#target2.

APPENDICES

Appendix 4A

Native American Coordination, Summary*

* Copies of actual correspondence are included in Appendix G1.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Ms. Liana Stacy Hesler	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: phone call to cultural department--no answer, left message	none	3/20/2015: placed follow-up call to cultural department--no answer, left message with phone number to contact if there are any questions	none	8/5/2015: follow-up email sent	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Hesler on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed to the cultural department of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma on 2/13/2015, but no response was received. Another follow-up phone call was placed on 3/20/2015, but no response was received. A follow-up email was sent on 8/5/2015, but was returned as undeliverable.
Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Joseph Blanchard, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: phone call to cultural department--no answer, left message	none	3/20/2015: placed follow-up call to cultural department--no answer, left message with phone number to contact if there are any questions	none	8/5/2015: follow-up email sent	none	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Blanchard on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed to the cultural department of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma on 2/13/2015, but no response was received. Another follow-up phone call was placed on 3/20/2015, but no response was received. A follow-up email was sent on 8/5/2015, but no response has yet been received.
Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Edwina Butler-Wolfe, Governor	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: phone call--reached Governor's office receptionist, Eddie Brokeshoulder, who said letter would have been forwarded to J. Blanchard's office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Blanchard on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed to the Governor's Office of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma on 2/13/2015. The Office stated that the tribe's cultural department handles Section 106 matters and that the letter would have been forwarded to that department. No further consultation with the Governor's Office required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Cayuga Nation	Chief William Jacobs	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: phone call-- spoke to tribal office who said that William Jacobs is not associated with Cayuga Nation and that no contact information is available	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Chief Jacobs on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/6/2015. A follow-up call was placed to the tribal office for the Cayuga Nation. The Office stated that William Jacobs is no longer with the Cayuga Nation. No further consultation with Mr. Jacobs is required.
Cayuga Nation	Timothy Two Guns	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: email to address provided by tribal office requesting formal response	none	3/20/2015: follow-up email sent	none	8/05/2015: follow-up email sent	none	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Two Guns on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/6/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed to the tribal office of the Cayuga Nation on 2/13/2015 and an email address was provided as the best means to contact Mr. Two Guns. An email was sent to Mr. Two Guns on the same day requesting a formal response to the initial consultation request, but no response was received. A second follow-up email was sent on 3/20/2015, but no response was received. A third follow-up email was sent on 8/4/2015 with high importance, but no response has yet been received.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Delaware Nation	Nekole Alligood	12/31/2014 by letter to three other tribal contacts: Darrin Ahshapanek (EPA Director), Tamara Francis-Fourkiller (THPO), and Kerry Holton (Tribal President)	2/11/2015: letter from Nekole Alligood, Director Cultural Preservation Office, stating that no resources of interest will be endangered by Project; requested they be contacted in case of unanticipated discoveries	2/17/2015: emailed Alligood to acknowledge receipt of letter and request confirmation that she is appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Nation	2/17/2015: confirmed via email that she is the appropriate contact; provided current list of personnel and their email addresses	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to three other tribal members on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015 and 1/22/2015. Nekole Alligood responded by letter on 2/11/2015 stating that no resources of interest will be endangered by the Project and requesting that the tribe be contacted in the event of unanticipated discoveries. A follow-up email was sent to Ms. Alligood on 2/17/2015 to confirm that she is the appropriate Section 106 contact person for the Delaware Nation. Ms. Alligood responded via email on 2/17/2015 that she is the appropriate contact and that Ms. Francis-Fourkiller is no longer employed by the Delaware Nation and Mr. Ahshapanek and Ms. Holton have been replaced. She provided a current list of relevant Delaware Nation personnel and their email addresses. Ms. Alligood, Corey Smith, or Jason Ross are the current Section 106 coordinators. The tribe should be contacted in the event of unanticipated discoveries during construction.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Delaware Nation	Corey Smith	12/31/2014 by letter to three other tribal contacts: Darrin Ahshapanek (EPA Director), Tamara Francis-Fourkiller (THPO), and Kerry Holton (Tribal President)	2/11/2015: email from Corey Smith, Assistant Director, Delaware Nation Cultural Preservation, transmitting Ms. Alligood's letter, requesting that they be contacted in case of unanticipated discoveries, and request for continued updates on the Project	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to three other tribal members on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015 and 1/22/2015. Mr. Smith responded by email on 2/11/2015 in which he transmitted Ms. Alligood's letter and requested that the tribe be contacted in the event of unanticipated discoveries and receive updated on the Project. The tribe should be contacted in the event of unanticipated discoveries during construction and should be kept updated on the Project.
Delaware Nation	Darrin Ahshapanek, EPA Director	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/17/2015: emailed Alligood to acknowledge receipt of letter and request confirmation that she is appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Nation	2/17/2015: confirmed via email that she is the appropriate contact; provided current list of personnel and their email addresses	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Ahshapanek on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. In an email dated 2/17/2015, Nekole Alligood, Director Cultural Preservation Office, Delaware Nation, stated that Mr. Ahshapanek is no longer EPA director. No further consultation with Mr. Ahshapanek is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Delaware Nation	Ms. Tamara Francis-Fourkiller, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/17/2015: emailed Alligood to acknowledge receipt of letter and request confirmation that she is appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Nation	2/17/2015: confirmed via email that she is the appropriate contact; provided current list of personnel and their email addresses	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Francis-Fourkiller on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/22/2015. In an email dated 2/17/2015, Nekole Alligood, Director Cultural Preservation Office, Delaware Nation, stated that Ms. Francis-Fourkiller is no longer employed by the Delaware Nation. No further consultation with Ms. Francis-Fourkiller is required.
Delaware Nation	Kerry Holton, Tribal President	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/17/2015: emailed Alligood to acknowledge receipt of letter and request confirmation that she is appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Nation	2/17/2015: confirmed via email that she is the appropriate contact; provided current list of personnel and their email addresses	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Francis-Fourkiller on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/22/2015. In an email dated 2/17/2015, Nekole Alligood, Director Cultural Preservation Office, Delaware Nation, stated that Ms. Holton is no longer tribal chair for the Delaware Nation. No further consultation with Ms. Holton is required.
Delaware Tribe of Indians	Susan Bachor	12/31/2014 by letter	1/8/2015: request to enter into consultation	2/17/2015: emailed Bachor to acknowledge receipt of letter and request confirmation that she is appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Tribe of Indians	2/18/2015: confirmed via email that she and Blair Fink are the Historic Preservation Representatives for the tribe on tribal lands in the east. 3/4/2015: reiterated via email that she and Blair Fink are the Project reviewers and requested that survey be sent to an address she provided.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Bachor on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. Ms. Bachor responded with a letter on 1/8/2015 requesting to enter into consultation. A follow-up email was sent to Ms. Bachor on 2/17/2015 requesting confirmation that she was the appropriate Section 106 contact for the Delaware Tribe of Indians. Ms. Bachor replied via email on 2/18/2015 confirming that she is a Historic Preservation Representative for the Delaware Tribe of Indians along with Blair Fink and that they cover projects on tribal lands in the east. Ms. Bachor emailed again on 3/4/2015 requesting that all surveys be forwarded to her or Blair Fink at the address provided. The Delaware Tribe of Indians would like to be a consulting party and would like all surveys provided to them.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Delaware Tribe of Indians	Dr. Brice Obermeyer, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	1/5-6/2015: stipulation that fee of \$250 required	2/24/2015: Sent check for \$250.00 tribal review fee to Brice Obermeyer.	2/25/2015: email acknowledging receipt of consultation fee, with request that original consultation request be emailed to him for forwarding to the Pennsylvania tribal office.	2/27/2015: emailed the original consultation request letter addressed to Susan Bachor along with Ms. Bachor's response	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Dr. Obermeyer on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. Dr. Obermeyer responded via email on 1/5/2015 with the stipulation that consultation required payment of a fee, with was sent on 2/24/2015. Dr. Obermeyer acknowledged receipt of the consultation fee via email on 2/25/2015 and requested that the original consultation letter be sent to him via email so he could forward it to the tribal office in Pennsylvania. Replied to his email on 2/27/2015, attaching the original consultation request letter addressed to Susan Bachor as well as her response. No further consultation with Dr. Obermeyer is required.
Delaware Tribe of Indians	Paula Pechonick, Chief	12/31/2014 by letter	none	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Pechonick on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. Email correspondence with Susan Bachor on 2/17/2015 and 2/18/2015 confirmed that she and Blair Fink are the tribal representatives on cultural matters for projects on tribal lands in the east and that Ms. Pechonick is no longer the tribal chief. No further consultation with Ms. Pechonick is required.
Delaware Tribe of Indians	Blair Fink	12/31/2014 by letter	none	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Fink on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. Email correspondence with Susan Bachor on 2/17/2015 and 2/18/2015 confirmed that she and Ms. Fink are the tribal representatives on cultural matters for projects on tribal lands in the east. The Delaware Tribe of Indians would like to be a consulting party.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	Ms. Robin Dushane	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/15: called and talked to Ms. Dushane, who requested that the 12/31/2014 letter be sent to her electronically (sent via URS secure file transfer)	none	3/19/2015: called and talked to Ms. Dushane again--she provided a street address to which she requested the initial consultation request be resent; letter resent on 3/20/2015 via USPS certified mail because FedEx would not accept the address Ms. Dushane provided.	none	8/5/2015: follow-up email sent	none	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Dushane on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed to Ms. Dushane on 2/13/2015, who requested that the consultation request be sent to her electronically. The letter was emailed the same day, but was returned as undeliverable due to file size of the attachment. The letter was posted to the URS secure file transfer website later the same day, with retrieval instructions sent directly to the email address, but the document was not retrieved by Ms. Dushane. Another follow-up call was placed to Ms. Dushane on 3/19/2015, at which time she provided a street address and requested the letter be sent to her via FedEx. FedEx would not accept the street address Ms. Dushane provided, so the letter was resent on 3/20/2015 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 3/23/2015. No response was received. A follow-up email was sent to Ms. Dushane on 8/05/2015 with high importance, but no response has yet been received.
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	Ms. Roxane Weldon, EPA Director	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/15: informed by Robin Dushane that Ms. Weldon no longer works for the tribe	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Weldon on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. In a follow-up phone conversation with Robin Dushane on 2/13/2015, Ms. Dushane stated that Ms. Weldon no longer works for the tribe. No further consultation with Ms. Weldon is required.
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	Glenna Wallace, Chief	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/15: informed by Robin Dushane that Chief Wallace forwards cultural inquiries to her	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Wallace on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. In a follow-up phone conversation with Robin Dushane on 2/13/2015, Ms. Dushane stated that she is the tribal representative on cultural matters. No further consultation with Ms. Wallace is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Oneida Indian Nation	Stephen J. Selden, Esq.	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015	2/13/2015: Left voicemail with Ms. Misita, Land Administrator requesting confirmation that Mr. Jesse Bergevin was the appropriate contact for Section 106 consultation with the Onieda Indian Nation.	2/13/2105:Ms. Misita returned call, confirming that Mr. Bergevin was appropriate Section 106 contact, that Mr. Halbritter would have sent the initial consultation letter to Mr. Bergevin, and that Stephen Selden was no longer general counsel for the Oneida Nation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Selden on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. A follow-up phone call was made on 2/13/2015 and a message was left on voicemail. Ms. Misita, Land Administrator for the Onieda Indian Nation, returned the call on 2/13/2015 and confirmed that Stephen Selden is no longer general counsel for the Oneida Nation. She indicated that Mr. Jesse Bergevin is the appropriate Section 106 contact for the Onieda Indian Nation. No further consultation with Mr. Selden is required.
Oneida Indian Nation	Raymond Halbritter, Nation Representative	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015	2/13/2015: Left voicemail with Ms. Misita requesting confirmation that Mr. Jesse Bergevin was the appropriate contact for Section 106 consultation with the Onieda Indian Nation	2/13/2105:Ms. Misita returned call, confirming that Mr. Bergevin was appropriate Section 106 contact, that Mr. Halbritter would have sent the initial consultation letter to Mr. Bergevin, and that Stephen Selden was no longer general counsel for the Oneida Nation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Halbritter on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. A follow-up phone call was made on 2/13/2015 and a message was left on voicemail. Ms. Misita, Land Administrator for the Onieda Indian Nation, returned the call on 2/13/2015 and confirmed that Mr. Halbritter, nation Representative, would have sent the initial consultation letter to Mr. Jesse Bergevin. No further consultation with Mr. Halbritter is required.
Oneida Indian Nation	Laura Misita, Land Administrator	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015	2/13/2015: Left voicemail with Ms. Misita requesting confirmation that Mr. Jesse Bergevin was the appropriate contact for Section 106 consultation with the Onieda Indian Nation.	2/13/2105:Ms. Misita returned call, confirming that Mr. Bergevin was appropriate Section 106 contact, that Mr. Halbritter would have sent the initial consultation letter to Mr. Bergevin, and that Stephen Selden was no longer general counsel for the Oneida Nation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Misita on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. A follow-up phone call was made on 2/13/2015 and a message was left on voicemail. Ms. Misita, Land Administrator for the Onieda Indian Nation, returned the call on 2/13/2015 and confirmed that Mr. Bergevin was the appropriate Section 106 contact. No further consultation with Ms. Misita is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Oneida Indian Nation	Jesse Bergevin, Historian	12/31/2014 by letter	1/16/2015: left message requesting more information	1/16/2015: called and discussed Project and Mr. Bergevin's concerns	1/20/2015: letter documenting interest in Project and specific tribal concerns and requesting information on survey methods	2/6/2015: Sent letter addressing concerns and providing copy of survey methods.	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Bergevin on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. In a 1/16/2015 telephone call, Mr. Bergevin informed URS of a specific archaeological resource type of importance to the Nation and requested to be informed of archaeological sites as they are found. By letter of 1/20/2015, Mr. Bergevin reiterated the Nation's concerns with a specific archaeological resource type and ancestral Oneida archaeological sites. Mr. Bergevin requested 1) that FERC consult with the Nation before making any decisions or determinations in the Section 106 process for the Project. In addition Mr. Bergevin stated that the Nation would like to be included in the development of the scope of work for cultural resource studies and to review any cultural resource studies for the Project. By letter dated 2/6/2015, Mr. Bergevin was provided 1) a copy of the Project's archaeological field methods, 2) notice that the archaeological site types of interest to the Nation would be recorded, and 3) that the results of the archaeological survey would be provided for his review. The Oneida Indian Nation would like to be consulted as part of the Section 106 process.
Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	Ed Delgado, Chairman	12/31/2014 by letter	none							The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Delgado on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. No response has yet been received.
Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	Corina Williams, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: Left voicemail requesting a response to initial consultation letter.						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Williams on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed on 2/13/2015, but no response has yet been received.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Onondaga Nation	Tony Gonyea, Faithkeeper	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/9/2015: letter re-sent c/o Bev Lyons because delivery of original letter could not be confirmed; original mailing returned as undeliverable on 3/20/2015						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Gonyea on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, but was returned as undeliverable on 3/20/2015. The letter was resent via FedEx on 2/9/2015 to an address provided by Bev Lyons of the Nation. Delivery was confirmed on 2/10/2015, but no response has yet been received.
Seneca Nation of Indians	Scott Abrams, THPO	2/18/2015 by letter	2/19/2015: Jay Toth, Seneca Nation Archaeologist responded by email that the Seneca Nation Historic Preservation office 1) had no concerns with the Project, 2) that the Nation would defer to the Delaware Nation, 3) that the Nation should be contacted if scope changes or cultural/burial sites are encountered	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was first sent to Melissa Bach and Beverly Cook, but it a follow-up phone call on 2/18/2015 confirmed that Scott Abrams is the current THPO. The initial consultation request was sent to Mr. Abrams on 2/18/2015 via FedEx. On 2/19/2015, Jay Toth responded that the Seneca Nation has no concerns with the Project, but requested that the Nation should be contacted if scope changes or cultural/burial sites are encountered.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Seneca Nation of Indians	Melissa Bach, THPO. New THPO is Scott Abrams	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Spoke w/ Scott Abrams (New THPO as of January 2015). He did not receive initial (12/31/2014) request for consultation addressed to Bach. Requested re-submittal of initial letter. Abrams also confirmed that Maurice A. John is current president. Re-submitted initial request for consultation via FedEx on 2/18/2015 due to file size	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Bach on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed on 2/18/2015 and Scott Abrams responded that Ms. Bach is no longer the THPO. No further consultation with Ms. Bach is required.
Seneca Nation of Indians	Beverly Cook, President, Note: Maurice A. John Sr., is current President	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Spoke w/ Scott Abrams (New THPO as of January 2015). He did not receive initial (12/31/2014) request for consultation addressed to Bach. Requested re-submittal of initial letter. Abrams also confirmed that Maurice A. John is current president. Re-submitted initial request for consultation via FedEx on 2/18/2015 due to file size	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Cook on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/6/2015. A follow-up call was placed on 2/18/2015 and Scott Abrams responded that he is the new THPO and that Beverly Cook is no longer Seneca Nation President. No further consultation with Ms. Cook is required.
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma	LeRoy Howard, Chief	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: Spoke to secretary, left contact info for return call.						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Howard on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was made on 2/13/2015 and a message was left with the tribe's secretary. No response has yet been received.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma	Paul Barton, Historic Preservation Officer	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/13/2015: Spoke to secretary, left contact info for return call.						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Barton on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was made on 2/13/2015 and a message was left with the tribe's secretary. No response has yet been received.
Shawnee Tribe	Ron Sparkman, Chairman	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Spoke w/ Kim Jumper. She requested re-submittal of initial consultation request. Stated that Sparkman would have forwarded initial request to her.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Sparkman on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed on 2/18/2015 and Kim Jumper, THPO, stated that Mr. Sparkman would have forwarded initial request to her. No further consultation with Mr. Sparkman is required.
Shawnee Tribe	Kim Jumper, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Spoke w/ Kim Jumper. She requested re-submittal of initial consultation request. Stated that Sparkman would have forwarded initial request to her.	2/20/2015: Kim Jumper responded by email that Shawnee Tribe had no concerns, but should be re-contacted if archaeological materials are encountered during construction.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. Jumper on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed on 2/18/2015 during which Ms. Jumper requested that the initial consultation request be resent, which was done on 2/19/2015. Ms. Jumper responded on 2/20/2015 that the Shawnee Tribe has no concerns, but should be re-contacted if archaeological materials are encountered during construction.
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe	Ken Jocks, Director	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Left voicemail w/ Arnold Printup requesting return call to discuss initial consultation request.	Arnold Printup confirmed that Ken Jocks should have forwarded the initial consultation request to him.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Jocks on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed on 2/18/2015 and a voicemail was left for Arnold Printup. Mr. Printup responded that Mr. Jocks should have forwarded the initial consultation request to him. No further consultation with Mr. Jocks is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe	Arnold Printup	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Left voicemail w/ Arnold Printup requesting return call to discuss initial consultation request.	2/19/2015: Arnold Printup returned 2/18/2015 voicemail. He confirmed that 1) he is the Tribe's THPO, 2) that Ken Jocks should have forwarded the initial consultation request to him, 3) that Randy Hart is no longer Chief, 4) that Ron LaFrance, Jr. is one of three current Chiefs that also would have forwarded the request to him. Mr. Printup requested the initial consultation request by email and stated that he would respond on behalf of the Tribe.	2/20/2015: Emailed initial consultation request to Mr. Printup.	2/24/2015: Printup emailed confirmation that St. Regis Mohawk would like to participate in Section 106 consultation for the Project.	2/25/2015: Emailed Printup to request any information regarding historic properties of importance to tribe that might be affected by Project.		The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Printup on 12/31/2014 via USPS certified mail, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up phone call was placed on 2/18/2015 and a voicemail message was left. On 2/19/2015 Mr. Printup returned the call and provided information about current staffing at the tribe, including the fact that he is the tribe's THPO and would respond on behalf of the tribe. He requested that the initial consultation request be resent to him via email. The request was sent out on 2/20/2015. On 2/24/2015 Mr. Printup emailed confirmation that St. Regis Mohawk would like to participate in Section 106 consultation for the Project.
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe	Chief Randy Hart	12/31/2014 by letter	none		2/19/2015: Arnold Printup stated that Randy Hart is no longer Chief and that Ron LaFrance, Jr. is one of three current Chiefs that also would have forwarded the request to him.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Chief Hart on 12/31/2014 via USPS, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. As per a follow-up phone call with Arnold Printup on 2/19/2015, Randy Hart is no longer Chief. Ron LaFrance, Jr. is one of three current Chiefs and would have forwarded the request to Arnold Printup. No further consultation with Chief Hart is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans	Sherry White, THPO	12/31/2014 by letter	1/27/2015: email from Bonney Hartley, Tribal Historic Preservation Assistant--NY Office (Troy, NY); requested continuing consultation at Delaware River crossing in Bucks County, PA; requested copy of field survey protocols	2/4/2015: Emailed field survey methodology to Ms. Hartley; 2/18/2015: Left voicemail w/ Historic Preservation Office requesting return call.	2/19/2015: Sherry White returned 2/18/2015 phone call. She confirmed that 1) she is the Band THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the Asst. THPO, 2) she and Ms. Hartley both represent the Band in Section 106 issues, 3) that most correspondence would come from Ms. Hartley, 4) Robert Chicks was not the current Band President, 5) Wally Miller is the current Band President, and should have forwarded the initial request to her, 6) Greg Bunker dealt with environmental affairs, 7) she would check to see if he planned to respond to the initial consultation request. Ms. White requested re-submittal of initial consultation letter.	2/19/2015: Emailed initial consultation request to Sherry White.	2/25/2015: Ms. White responded by email that Mr. Bunker had no comments on the Project and that Ms. Bonney Hartley handles Section 106 consultation for the Stockbridge Munsee Band of Mohicans;	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Ms. White on 12/31/2014 via USPS, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. Bonney Hartley, Tribal Historic Preservation Assistant responded by email on 1/27/2015 that the THPO wished to continue consultation and that the Band's specific area of interest was in Bucks County, Pennsylvania where the Project crossed the Delaware River. Ms. Hartley requested a copy of field survey protocols. A copy of the field survey protocols was sent to Ms. Hartley via email on 2/4/2015. In order to verify that the appropriate parties in the Band had been contacted, a voicemail was left with the Band's Historic Preservation Office on 2/18/2015. Ms. White returned the call on 2/19/2015, confirming that Ms. Hartley handles Section 106 consultation for the Stockbridge Munsee Band of Mohicans. The Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans would like to continue consultation on the Project, and the point of contact is Bonney Hartley.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans	Robert Chicks, Tribal President	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Left voicemail w/ Historic Preservation Office requesting return call.	2/19/2015: Sherry White returned 2/18/2015 phone call. She confirmed that she is the Band THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the Asst. THPO. Ms. White indicated that Robert Chicks was not the current Band President. She said that Wally Miller is the current Band President, and that he would have forwarded the initial request to her.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Chicks on 12/31/2014 via USPS, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed to the tribe's Historic Preservation Office on 2/18/2015 and a message was left on voicemail. Sherry White returned the call on 2/19/2015 and stated that she is the THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the assistant THPO and that Mr. Chicks is no longer the Band president. No further consultation with Mr. Chicks is required.
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans	Greg Bunker	12/31/2014 by letter	none	2/18/2015: Left voicemail w/ Historic Preservation Office requesting return call.	2/19/2015: Sherry White returned 2/18/2015 phone call. She confirmed that she is the Band THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the Asst. THPO. Ms. White said that Greg Bunker dealt with environmental affairs but that she would check to see if he planned to respond to the initial consultation request.	2/19/2015: Emailed initial consultation request to Sherry White.	2/25/2015: Ms. Sherry White, THPO responded by email that Mr. Bunker had no comments on the Project.	n/a	n/a	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Bunker on 12/31/2014 via USPS, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. A follow-up call was placed to the tribe's Historic Preservation Office on 2/18/2015 and a message was left on voicemail. Sherry White returned the call on 2/19/2015 and stated that she is the THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the assistant THPO. The initial consultation request was then resent to Ms. White on 2/19/2015. She responded via email on 2/25/2015 that Mr. Bunker had no comments on the Project. No further consultation with Mr. Bunker is required.

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans	Bonney Hartley	12/31/2014 by letter to three other tribal contacts: Sherry White (THPO), Robert Chicks (Tribal President), and Greg Bunker	1/27/2015: email from Bonney Hartley, Tribal Historic Preservation Assistant--NY Office (Troy, NY); requested continuing consultation at Delaware River crossing in Bucks County, PA; requested copy of field survey protocols	2/4/2015: Emailed field survey methodology to Ms. Hartley; 2/18/2015: left voicemail w/ Historic Preservation Office requesting return call.	2/19/2015: Sherry White returned 2/18/2015 phone call confirming that she is the Band THPO and Bonnie Hartley is the Assistant THPO.	2/19/2015: Emailed initial consultation request to Sherry White.	3/26/2015: Ms. Hartley sent a letter via email requesting field testing schedule for the Delaware River crossing area and providing tribe's inadvertent discovery plan	4/3/2015: emailed Ms. Hartley to request good time for a conference call; call was held on 4/9/2015, at which time Ms. Hartley again requested advance notification of survey schedule on parcels adjacent to the Delaware River; minutes of the meeting were distributed to Ms. Hartley on 4/10/2015, and she accepted them with a minor modification to her title (she had been named THPO); notification for survey on the Pennsylvania side of the river was provided on 6/3/2015 via phone message and email.	6/5/2015: Ms. Hartley declined to participate in the survey and stated she was comfortable with the survey methodology; she requested she be informed if the crew found large densities of materials or features; immediately responded to Ms. Hartley that she would be kept informed and would be provided with a copy of the Phase I survey report.	The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to three other tribal contacts on 12/31/2014 via USPS, with delivery confirmation on 1/5/2015. Bonney Hartley, Tribal Historic Preservation Assistant responded by email on 1/27/2015 that the THPO wished to continue consultation and that the Band's specific area of interest was in Bucks County, Pennsylvania where the Project crossed the Delaware River. Ms. Hartley requested a copy of field survey protocols. A copy of the field survey protocols was sent to Ms. Hartley via email on 2/4/2015. In order to verify that the appropriate parties in the Band had been contacted, a voicemail was left with the Band's Historic Preservation Office on 2/18/2015. Sherry White returned the call on 2/19/2015, confirming that Ms. Hartley handles Section 106 consultation for the Stockbridge Munsee Band of Mohicans. She reiterated this fact in an email on 2/25/2015. In a letter dated 3/26/2015, sent via email, Ms. Hartley reiterated the desire of the Band to continue consultation where the proposed line crosses the Delaware. She requested the schedule for archaeological testing in this area as the Band is considering archaeological monitoring; she also attached the tribe's inadvertent discovery policy and requested that it be incorporated into the testing protocols. In an email exchange on 4/3-8/2015, a time was set up for a conference call to discuss the tribe's specific area of interest. The call was held on 4/9/2015, at which time Ms. Hartley was provided with additional Project information specific to her area of interest, as well as information regarding outreach to other Native American tribes. She requested that she be kept informed of the Project schedule. The minutes of the meeting were submitted to Ms. Hartley for approval on 4/10/2015; she responded on same day accepting the minutes with a minor correction to her title, which had changed to THPO. A phone call and an email were placed to Ms. Hartley on 6/3/2015 informing her of the intention to survey tracts on the Pennsylvania side of the river on 6/8-9/2015. On 6/5/2015 Ms. Hartley declined to participate in the survey, said that she was comfortable with the survey methodology, but would like to be contacted in the event of a potentially significant find. In SEPTEMBER 2015

Appendix 4A
Native American Coordination

Tribe	Name	PennEast Initial Contact	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 1	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 2	Tribal Response	PennEast Follow-up 3	Tribal Response	Summary of Contacts
Tonawanda Seneca Nation	Chief Darwin Hill	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015	2/18/2015: emailed Chief Hill requesting response to initial 12/31/2104 letter requesting consultation						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Chief Hill on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. A follow-up email was sent on 2/18/2015, but no response has yet been received.
Tuscarora Nation	Leo Henry, Chief	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015							The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Henry on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. No response has yet been received.
Tuscarora Nation	Bryan Printup	12/31/2014 by letter	No response as of 2/13/2015	2/13/2015 emailed Printup requesting response to initial 12/31/2014 letter requesting consultation						The initial consultation request with Project mapping was sent to Mr. Printup on 12/31/2014 via FedEx, with delivery confirmation on 1/2/2015. A follow-up email was sent on 2/13/2015, but no response has yet been received.