

I request that Commissioner Honigberg's decision on my petition for intervention be reviewed by the committee or subcommittee, as applicable pursuant to" Site 202.11(f):

Any party aggrieved by a decision on a petition to intervene may within 10 days request that the decision be reviewed by the committee or subcommittee, as applicable."

On Sat, Mar 19, 2016 at 1:55 PM, Kris pastoriza <krispastoriza@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Ms. Monroe, Mr. Honigberg rejected my petition for intervention on the grounds that I do not abut the project. He therefore makes the judgement, before the application has been heard, that it will not have adverse effects upon non-abutting landowners. This is premature.

More importantly, he did not address my request for intervenor status on the grounds that my land is on the original preferred route, which is still "on the table." In their filing of 2/26/16, which has been loading for 20 minutes and is still incomplete, so I will summarize, NPT states that the former preferred overland route is their alternative route though they do not now consider it feasible.

I request that as long as the former preferred route is an alternative, in NPT's filing, abutters to this route should be granted intervenor status.

Kris Pastoriza