

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 will have to worry about being killed every day, and having
2 our land and our home being instantly incinerated from an
3 explosion, along with hundreds of my neighbors. I'm sorry,
4 but that just is simply not acceptable.

PS2A1-40

5 We do not have the topography and the terrain to
6 accommodate this project. The Appalachian Basin and the
7 Blue Ridge Mountains are some of the steepest, most rugged
8 topography, mountain range on the planet Earth.

PS2A1-40

Steep slopes and rugged topography are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-pipelines in mountainous terrain.

PS2A1-41

9 This project has not been demonstrated for public
10 need. I personally will not get any benefit from it. I
11 just don't think it's gonna fit in this geographic location
12 where you want it to go. If it doesn't fit, you shouldn't
13 build it. All right.

PS2A1-41

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

14 Commissioner Lefleur, you told the National Press
15 Club in January, 2015, that we had a situation here, when
16 the FERC office had protestors there for over two weeks.
17 Well, guess what? This is our home and it's our land, and
18 we're not going anywhere. We're not gonna go away, and we
19 won't back down.

20 MR. LIPSCOMB: My name is John Lipscomb. I am a
21 landowner and my address is 346 Quail Valley Lane, Boones
22 Mill.

23 Number one, I don't know for sure what pieces of
24 this we're supposed to be commenting on, but I would like to
25 go on record as saying that this is absolutely wrong in my

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 27

PS2A1-42 | 1 opinion, because the usage of imminent domain should benefit
2 the public in particular, or including the public from which
3 the property is being taken. And this, as far as I can see,
4 as far as anybody's proven to me, is a benefit only to the
5 shareholders of the pipeline company. I don't see any
6 benefit whatsoever to the people of this community.

PS2A1-43 | 7 Number two, I'm very concerned about blasting,
8 because it will dislodge the ground water path of travel,
9 and could easily cause many wells of the homeowners to
10 either dry up because the water is either diverted away from
11 their well, or it could cause contamination because the
12 water's diverted into different areas before it gets to
13 their well, in either event, rendering the value of their

PS2A1-44 | 14 property almost worthless.

PS2A1-45 | 15 And I would like to make a comment that I think
16 it is that FERC should not request, but demand, that the
17 pipeline company provide a plan for mediation of all water
18 supply problems, which in my opinion, would probably be
19 impossible in some cases and therefore, even though they say
20 that, "Hey, you know, if you have a problem with your water
21 after our blasting, we'll fix it," I believe that's a hollow
22 promise. And I believe that FERC should not consider
23 issuing them a license unless they can prove that they have
24 the means to fix these problems they're gonna be causing.

PS2A1-46 | 25 Also, the herbicides that will be used to keep

PS2A1-42 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PS2A1-43 See the response to comment IND226-17 regarding water wells and blasting.

PS2A1-44 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-45 Mountain Valley would be responsible for any damage to structures, including water wells, due to blasting.

PS2A1-46 See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 28

PS2A1-46 cont'd
1 the land cleared in the path of the pipeline, even after the
2 pipeline is constructed, will not only contaminate the soil
3 and the water, but also will cause a change in the nature,
4 especially in this hilly country of the ground cover and not
5 allow it to re-establish itself and create potentially many
6 areas where we'll see new landslides and problems with loose
7 land. And I guess there are more, but that's the extent of
8 my notes right now.

9 MRS. WRAY: We're husband and wife. Colin and
10 Betty Wray. Our street address is 1379 Golden View Road,
11 Glade Hill, Virginia 24092.

12 The pipeline is coming 1,000 feet from our home.
13 The access road will be about 500 feet from our road. And
PS2A1-47
14 we're just concerned. We can't see the county's gonna
15 profit from this. I think it's gonna destroy a beautiful
16 area.

PS2A1-48
17 And I'm concerned about how this fracking
18 process, you know, how the procedure, how they get the oil
19 out of the ground. I'm very concerned about the environment
20 there. The environment is very, very much a concern. The
21 water. And I know it's not for the good of our county.

PS2A1-49
22 It's greed, I think. It's gonna be piped probably overseas.
23 They're gonna put it on ships and take it overseas and sell
24 it.

25 MR. WRAY: Another concern we have is the

PS2A1-47 As stated in table 4.9.2-3, Franklin County, Virginia would receive about \$2.1 million in annual taxes. After pipeline installation underground, the right-of-way would be restored and revegetated. Section 4.8 of the EIS discusses visual resources.

PS2A1-48 The proposed projects would transport natural gas, not oil. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS2A1-49 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 29

PS2A1-50 | 1 property value of our home. The insurance will probably be
2 increased. And with it being this close to us, we're

PS2A1-51 | 3 concerned about if something happened, a blast force from --
4 MRS. WRAY: Danger.
5 MR. WRAY: -- the danger that come from that.
6 And we are concerned with something with this much pressure,
7 how is this gonna be controlled, you know. They say it's
8 safe here, but we keep seeing it in the news and hearing in
9 the news where these lines are exploding and damaging homes
10 hundreds of feet away from 'em, so that's what our big
11 concern is the damage to our property plus losing property
12 value also.

PS2A1-52 | 13 MRS. WRAY: And the historical aspects. Our
14 property, our piece has been in the family for at least 150
15 years and Franklin County is rich in history. And not just
16 for our area, we're just very, very concerned.

PS2A1-53 | 17 MR. WRAY: Well, and also, the water. We're
18 concerned about the water. How are they gonna guarantee us
19 that our water will not be damaged or be destroyed?
20 MRS. WRAY: Protect the environment.
21 MR. WRAY: So that is a big concern, the water,
22 what they're crossing so many streams and that was a big
23 concern.
24 MR. McDEAVITT: My name is Thomas McDeavitt. And
25 I own two parcels of property in this county and they're --

PS2A1-50 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values and comment IND12-2 regarding mortgages.

PS2A1-51 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A1-52 Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS2A1-53 The EIS addresses water resources in section 4.3. Drinking water is discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-54 | 1 it's running down the street -- the pipeline is going less
2 than three-quarters of a mile from my house, or half a mile.
3 I'm here on the property value and property
4 rights. Because I own a property in Florida, too, and they
5 run two pipelines within a mile of my house down there, and
6 the property values dropped almost \$40,000 in that short
7 period of time, from the time they run the two pipelines
8 through there.

PS2A1-55 | 9 The other thing is, is they're violating
10 Amendment 4 and 5 of the Constitution and trying to trespass
11 on everybody's property when they don't have the right to do
12 it. And I'm here just because I, you know, I didn't do it
13 when the first one went through in Florida, but I'm here to
14 keep 'em from doing this one here in Virginia. And it will
15 affect indirectly both my pieces of property. So I would
16 like to see it stopped.

17 MS. BENNETT: I'm Katie Bennett. I am not on the
18 pipeline path, but I'm within probably five miles of it, so
19 I'm close.

PS2A1-56 | 20 My thing is, as far as I can tell from what I
21 have read so far, is that we are not gonna benefit from this
22 pipeline in any way, that the gas will be shipped overseas.
23 Other foreign countries will benefit. We will not.

PS2A1-57 | 24 They'll bring in their own workers, their own
25 crew, our people will not have any jobs. They will not

PS2A1-54 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-55 The statements regarding surveys are noted.

PS2A1-56 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A1-57 See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-58 | 1 benefit. My land value will drop really a lot, so I'm gonna
2 lose there, too. And with the blasting and everything, it's

PS2A1-59 | 3 gonna shift my water line, and I'm gonna lose there also.
4 So I can't see where that is gonna benefit
5 Franklin County in any shape, form or fashion. That it is
6 going to do harm all the way around. So I don't -- I can't
7 understand why that we are put in this position that we've
8 got to fight for our rights. When we didn't ask for this to
9 happen to us.

PS2A1-60 | 10 And look at the explosions they've had along the
11 property that the pipeline has. They've just had one recent
12 explosion -- I believe it was yesterday. And then in
13 Pennsylvania County, I believe it was, they found the leak
14 that no one even knew was there. So what if, by some
15 chance, a child had been playing, dropped a match or a
16 hunter shot and the bullet hit the fire -- hit wherever the
17 leakage was. There's no control.

18 And another thing I just read said that, since it
19 was rural area, that the pipes that they're going to use are
20 not very strong. They're weak pipes because, they say, you
21 won't have as much life damage or property damage, according
22 to them. One life lost is too many lives lost, in my
23 opinion. But it also is saying country people or rural
24 people are not worth much. So not only do they devalue our
25 land, they devalue human life. So we're gonna lose. We

PS2A1-58 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-59 See the response to comment IND226-17 regarding water wells and blasting. See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County.

PS2A1-60 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. The DOT regulations determine class pipeline thickness as described in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 won't gain jobs, we won't benefit from any of it.

2 MS. MARSH: My name is Eleanor Ann Marsh. And

3 I'm accompanied by my husband, Donald Paul Marsh. Our

4 address is 74 Cheyenne Lane, Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151.

5 And we are in the evacuation of the pipeline zone.

6 I'm gonna read you my message. My husband

7 Don and I, along with all the homeowners in Woods Edge

8 subdivision are located in the evacuation area of the

9 above-referenced pipeline, which is Docket CP16-10-000

10 Mountain Valley Pipeline. We are objecting to the

11 construction of said pipeline for the following reasons:

PS2A1-61

12 Number one, people in the blast area would be

13 displaced. Many are families that have lived on the land

14 for generations. They are farmers, ranchers, young families

15 raising their children in a clean and healthy environment.

16 Retired and elderly will lose their homes. Businesses will

17 be lost, and our peaceful, clean surroundings will be no

18 more. There is no benefit to these citizens, other than the

19 destruction that will result from the ugly path through

20 Virginia.

PS2A1-61

See the response to comment IND2-1. Landowners would continue to inhabit their homes adjacent to the proposed pipelines.

PS2A1-62

21 Number two, wildlife will be put in harms' way.

22 This is in a rural area, teeming with wildlife. Deer,

23 turkeys, ground hogs, raccoons, foxes, birds. I alone have

24 over 22 species of birds that I have identified on my

25 property. In fact, our property is certified as a wildlife

PS2A1-62

See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-62 cont'd | 1 habitat by the National Wildlife Federation, Certificate
2 Number 203050. I am sure they would not sanction this
3 pipeline. Also, I have found out, the Federal government,
4 not too long ago, relocated an endangered red wolf to our
5 area.

PS2A1-63 | 6 Number three, everyone in the evacuation area
7 will never have a good night's sleep again. How can you?
8 Wondering when this pipeline may explode. Are my children
9 playing near it? How can I ever sell my home? Who will

PS2A1-64 | 10 ever insure our property? There has already been a
11 construction loan turned down due to this pipeline. How can

PS2A1-65 | 12 we get a mortgage on our home if a need arises? How many

PS2A1-66 | 13 wells will collapse when they blast to bury the pipes? And
14 they call this Rocky Mount for a good reason. This area is
15 rocky.

PS2A1-67 | 16 Where will we get our water? What happens to the
17 streams, marshlands, nesting trees for birds, food for other

PS2A1-68 | 18 wildlife? This is a disaster in the making. We and our
19 neighbors love Rocky Mount, Franklin County. Please listen
20 to us and turn down this pipeline. And thank you for your
21 consideration.

22 MR. ANGLE: I'm a landowner along the proposed
23 pipeline. Dale Angle, 1116 Iron Ridge Road, Rocky Mount,
24 Virginia. This pipeline is proposed to go right smack
25 through the middle of the property that's been in the Angle

PS2A1-63 | See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-64 | See the response to comment IND12-2 regarding homeowners insurance.

PS2A1-65 | See the response to comment IND12-2 regarding mortgages.

PS2A1-66 | See the response to comment IND226-17 regarding water wells and blasting.

PS2A1-67 | Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS2A1-68 | Waterbodies are addressed in section 4.3 and wildlife in section 4.5 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 34

PS2A1-69 | 1 family since before the Revolutionary War. Had a honeybee
2 apiary there for fifty-six years. It's gonna destroy that.
3 The ecological damage of this thing crossing our
4 streams 144 times in Franklin County is gonna be
5 irreparable. There's already been pieces of property where
PS2A1-70 | 6 the bank found out this pipeline was going through the
7 property or the neighbor's property, they withdrew the
8 loans. Yet FERC says that this pipeline is not gonna
9 devalue our property.

PS2A1-71 | 10 And this pipeline is going right in front of my
11 house. It's crossing Indian village sites on my property
12 dating back 7,000 years. And we have the artifacts to prove
13 that. We have bowls made by the Indians that date back
14 before the pyramids.

PS2A1-72 | 15 It will damage our water supply. And the biggest
16 thing is, you can't repair all the damage it's gonna do.
17 Erosion, sediment and all this sort of thing's gonna be
18 major problem. So that's all I gotta say.

PS2A1-73 | 19 MR. FADER: I'm not a landowner on the pipeline
20 route. My name is Douglas Fader. I'm against it because
21 fracking's about the dumbest thing that this country's ever
22 allowed to happen. There's other ways to get fuel up for
23 one thing and running pipeline across everybody's property
24 but your own is fine with the people that got the money to
25 keep it from their property, but people don't have the

PS2A1-69 See the response to comment IND600-1 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-70 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property value.

PS2A1-71 Cultural resources are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS2A1-72 Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to FA11-15 regarding sedimentation and turbidity at waterbody crossings.

PS2A1-73 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 lawyers and the things to fight the government, or whatever
2 you wanna call it, the bureaucracy, it is criminal.

3 This country was founded on laws governed by our
4 creator, God, and our country is falling away from Him, and
5 it needs to come back around to understanding that we're
6 just slitting our own throats by allowing these things to
7 continue to happen. We have enough corruption in our
8 government right now that's unbelievable, and I'm sure that
9 they're gonna do what they're gonna do, whether I say I'm
10 for it or against it.

11 So I don't see that my opinion really matters a
12 whole lot, for a hill of beans, or whatever you wanna,
13 however you wanna say it, but I will voice my opinion. I'm
14 against it. And I guess that's about all I have to say.

15 MR. DUDLEY: My name is Alden Dudley, living in
16 Roanoke County, probably five miles away from the Mountain
17 Valley Pipeline. I do have an 8" East Tennessee gas
18 pipeline going across my three acres. Ironically, my
19 father, sixty years ago, designed the Colonial pipeline. He
20 was an engineer with Mobil Oil and he was the one to
21 determine where it went.

22 He took it from Houston to Shreveport, Louisiana,
23 and, because there were no mountains and then went east to
24 go around the mountains to major population areas so that
25 they could offload some of the product as it was moving

PS2A1-74

PS2A1-74

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 along. It started out with two pipes in Houston and ended
2 up with one pipe in Linden, New Jersey. But he avoided the
3 mountains because of the seismic considerations, the
4 elevations and landslides. And all of this, I think, was
5 very wise. He was telling me that when I was a teenager,
6 sixty years ago. I'm now 79.

PS2A1-75

7 The pipeline that is being proposed has 30% at
8 more than a 15 degree slope, 70% in landslide potential.
9 There are going to be fractures. It's not a question of
10 whether or not, it's just a question of when and where.

PS2A1-76

11 When you look at how the Colonial pipeline now, fifty-five
12 to sixty years old, is leaking seriously every two months
13 somewhere. Obviously that kind of thing is going to be
14 happening on MVP.

15 When you look at the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, they
16 count only leaks that exceed a barrel. The ones less than
17 that, they don't even count. So they are averaging forty a
18 year that are more than a barrel, and actually close to 500
19 a year that are less than a barrel. If you can get that
20 many leaks in a pipeline with crude oil, that's not so bad,
21 because it is so thick and viscous, it just kind of spits
22 and sputters out of the pinholes, but when you have gas
23 going under 1,400 psi, that is gonna jet out of that pipe
24 like crazy and you have a serious potential for explosions.

25 Cleveland in 1944 had natural gas tanks above

PS2A1-75

Steep slopes are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch pipelines in mountainous terrain.

PS2A1-76

Monitoring for leaks is discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 ground with one of them leaking. The cold liquid nitrogen
2 went down and into the sewers, mixed with sewer gases and
3 ultimately exploded, blowing manhole covers miles away. And
4 coming back, following its own gas line to the original
5 tank, and then the second tank blew some minutes after that
6 and finally Tanks 3 and 4 blew. By the time those four
7 tanks had blown, and they were on the edge of Lake Erie, so
8 half of the energy went out over the lake, the other half of
9 the energy had totally decimated a square mile, knocking out
10 70 houses, killing 200 people, leaving 600 more homeless,
11 knocking out two factories and the calculated, the power was
12 equal to one-sixth of the Nagasaki atomic bomb.

PS2A1-77

13 I'm afraid FERC does not realize how destructive
14 natural gas can be when it goes. And if they are so crazy
15 as to co-lay a Transco 42" pipe, the explosion of the two
16 combined will be absolutely phenomenal. And you're talking
17 a hole that would be over fifty feet deep and over a half
18 mile to a mile in diameter and if it's anywhere near
19 anything significant like the dams for the Smith Mountain
20 Lake or Leesville Lake, you have a calamity like you're not
21 expecting.

22 MS. FERGUSON: Kathy Ferguson. I do not own
23 property along the pipeline. We are lifelong residents here
24 in the county. People have been here for many generations.
25 Can I make my points now?

PS2A1-77

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 The first point that I think is of importance is
2 that we already have a petroleum pipeline. It runs from
3 Henry County through the county, and I'm amazed at the
4 people who don't even know about it. Because there's never
5 been a problem. There's never been a complaint. There's
6 never been a problem.

7 So I don't see why people are so up-in-arms about
8 this. My husband is gonna come in and speak. He had
9 another point that I'll say for him. My main concern is
10 that the pipeline would boost economic growth in our county.
11 Our county was a county of textiles, furniture, tobacco.
12 All of that is gone and NAFTA, with the enactment of NAFTA,
13 all of our industry is gone.

14 It's obsolete, and I feel that the pipeline would
15 help attract new business to our county to benefit the next
16 generation, my children, grandchildren, who leave the county
17 because we don't have any jobs. Because they're all gone.
18 I feel like we are at a disadvantage because other counties
19 do have the natural gas and that leaves us, you know, we
20 can't compete for industry. It makes it more difficult.
21 Our hands are tied.

22 I think that this would be our -- the natural gas
23 would be our best last chance to attract business here. And
24 I think that with natural gas being clean, it would be
25 better for businesses to utilize that, rather than oil and

PS2A1-78

PS2A1-78

Socioeconomics are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 other -- of course, coal has practically been annihilated.
2 As far as the aesthetics is concerned, it seems like people
3 really make a big issue of that.

4 The part of the county where I live, there has
5 been a water line that ran from Smith Mountain Lake to Burnt
6 Chimney and a little bit further beyond that. Nobody
7 complained about that. You know, it made a mess, everything
8 was torn up all along 122 up into the embankment, and so
9 the -- but the business that benefited there in Burnt
10 Chimney is thriving. It's growing. You have to have some
11 of this for progress.

12 The last point real quick, the naysayers -- see,
13 we were without power in the western end of this county even
14 into the 40s. People didn't want the power lines to run
15 through their property, and it was a huge issue. If the
16 power lines -- if those people had won, there wouldn't be
17 any electricity or cable, you know, think how we would be
18 affected at this point, at this time. Thank you.

PS2A1-79

19 MR. FERGUSON: Steve Ferguson. Well, I'm here in
20 favor of building this pipeline. I grew up in Franklin
21 County and I've lived here most of my life, except when I
22 was in the military. And I've seen what has happened to us
23 over the past sixty years. We used to be an economy based
24 on tobacco, furniture, textiles. That was the jobs we had.
25 Well, it's all gone now. And I think that with

PS2A1-79

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 this new industrial park that the county is building, I
2 understand we're gonna be able to get the natural gas there.
3 I just think it'd be a great thing for the young folks
4 coming up now, to possibly be able to stay here, rather than
5 having to go all over the country to find a job, or to
6 commute fifty miles one way to a job.

7 That's basically my reasons for supporting it,
8 because I know it'll be done safely. I don't think they
9 blow up that often, but I guess with anything you have a
10 chance. But I'm not concerned with it. I think the
11 benefits greatly outweigh the side effects or whatever.
12 That's all I have to say.

13 MR. O'HARA: I'm a landowner along the proposed
14 pipeline. I don't know my tract number. I know my address.
15 Again, my name is Alan Daniel O'Hara. And my address is
16 1425 Adney Gap Road, Callaway, Virginia.

PS2A1-80

17 I have a property and on this property I found an
18 amazing archeological device. And here's a picture of the
19 device if you wanted to look at it. What it is, it's an
20 ancient clock and calendar. And it is a very fragile
21 device. If you look at it, it's -- blasting near this clock
22 is gonna destroy it. And the shockwaves.

23 This is part of a very large complex that the
24 Mountain Valley Pipeline is aware of, that this is part of a
25 very large Archaic Indian area. It's roughly three-quarters

PS2A1-80

See the response to comment IND338 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

41

1 of a mile by a half a mile that I've been able to find, and
2 my archeologist. Mountain Valley Pipeline is well aware
3 that this is a large archeological area, and they have gone
4 around another sensitive area already, and they moved it and
5 moved it up closer to my property line.

6 If you want, I could describe the device and how
7 it works and everything, but I'm limited on my time.

8 There's artifacts in this area from 1 to 10,000 years old.
9 So I'm gonna file everything I can, and so basically I have
10 an archeological device that is very sensitive. It's a
11 national treasure and it could very well become a national
12 treasurer.

13 There are other devices around the world like
14 this one, but this one's in Franklin County, and there's
15 nothing else in the eastern United States like this.
16 There's another one out west that's very similar, but not
17 exactly the same. It's in Chaco Canyon. Chaco Canyon, New
18 Mexico, has a mineworks very similar to theirs.

19 I can tell you the equinoxes and the solstices.
20 I can tell you the solar noon. The solar noon is -- every
21 day the sun rises and sets and every day the sun is either
22 higher or lower than the day before. My device is able to
23 pick up that, and it's able to display sunlit images, of
24 which I can show you here.

25 So anyways, there is -- I have been able to

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 analyze and predict when the summer solstice and when the
2 equinox is, and 365 days a year, if I can see the sun, no
3 clouds, I can tell you when the solar noon is. The solar
4 noon today is actually at 1:03. And the solar noon,
5 basically a simple explanation is, as the sun rises to the
6 highest point of the day, and it crosses the meridian, which
7 is an imaginary line due south. This device picks up that
8 pattern. The light show works for about, anywhere from
9 forty minutes to an hour and forty minutes, depends on which
10 time of the year.

11 And this device, I would like to just reiterate
12 over and over, because if you look at it, it's a fragile
13 device. It's made up of boulders. It's probably about
14 eight boulders, anywhere from five to ten tons to a couple
15 tons, right down to even some smaller little rocks that are
16 put in as chalks, and there's a pallet. And there's two
17 chambers. There's an upper chamber and a lower chamber.
18 And this pallet is in between the two chambers.

PS2A1-81

19 This is another one of my archeological finds.
20 It's a buffalo, and it's also a mammoth.

PS2A1-82

21 MR. DORAZIO: John Dorazio. And I'm not a
22 landowner. I'm presidency of Roanoke Gas Company. I
23 support the MVP and agree with FERC's recommendations and
24 conclusion on the draft environmental impact study. And I
25 would like to briefly discuss three benefits that the

PS2A1-81

See the response to comment IND338 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-82

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

43

1 Mountain Valley Pipeline would bring to southwest Virginia.

2 First benefit is additional gas supply and
3 capacity to Roanoke Gas in southwest Virginia. Roanoke Gas
4 currently receives its gas from two existing transmission
5 lines. Unfortunately, both transmission lines are at or
6 near capacity. And there are limited options for additional
7 capacity to meet our future supply needs.

8 Mountain Valley Pipeline, being an open access
9 pipeline, and based on its proposed route, will provide
10 Roanoke Gas with a third source of supply and additional
11 capacity to our distribution system, enhancing the
12 reliability of our system, as well as bringing lower cost
13 Marcellus gas to our customers.

14 The second benefit is economic development for
15 southwest Virginia. Access to low-cost natural gas is
16 essential on attracting companies that require natural gas
17 for their business process. The Roanoke Regional
18 Partnership estimates that of the approximately 150
19 companies that have considered the Roanoke Valley as a
20 possible site between 2013 and 2015, 80% were manufacturers.
21 Of those 80%, approximately 80% required natural gas.

22 Had natural gas not been available, these
23 companies would not have considered Roanoke as a potential
24 site to locate. The Mountain Valley Pipeline also provides
25 an opportunity for those areas that currently do not have

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

44

1 access to natural gas, such as Franklin County. They have
2 the ability to attract industries that utilize natural gas,
3 which will create new jobs and investment in those
4 communities.

5 And third, having access to natural gas is an
6 important element of retention of existing businesses by
7 providing access to low-cost energy. A recent example of
8 this occurred in Hillsville, Virginia, where an existing
9 large manufacturer utilized fuel for the manufacturing
10 process. After the facility was constructed, a natural
11 pipeline was constructed in close proximity to Hillsville.

12 The manufacturer approached the county and said
13 if they could secure access to natural gas, to the
14 manufacturing facility, they would remain in the locality.
15 If not, they would close facility and move the operation to
16 another state. Because natural gas was brought to this
17 facility, 100 jobs in a small community were saved, as well
18 as the tax revenue.

19 In addition, once natural gas became available,
20 the locality was able to attract several new businesses to
21 their industrial park. For these reasons, additional gas
22 supplied Roanoke Gas Company in southwest Virginia, economic
23 development for southwest Virginia gas, and retention of
24 existing businesses, I support the Mountain Valley Pipeline.
25 Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 45

PS2A1-83 1 MR. EMBREY: Walter Reed Embrey. I feel like the
2 draft, the DEIS, is incomplete. I don't think it was as
3 thorough as it needs to be. I don't think a lot of the
4 mitigation issues of going through waters and streams and
5 such are there. I believe another reason it's incomplete

PS2A1-84 6 is, I don't believe the route has been completely finalized.
7 I think they know where they wanted to go kind
8 of, but all I hear out in the hallway is -- it was gonna go
9 here and now it's going here, and we're trying to find out
10 where it's going -- so I don't know if that's true or not.

PS2A1-85 11 I think there are a lot of archeological things. I don't
12 know for a fact, but talking with people and seeing the
13 archeological survey come through my property, just to get
14 over to the other property, that they weren't very
15 experienced.
16 It seemed to be one mature person and eight or
17 nine immature people walking through the woods with screens
18 and little hand trowels, which wouldn't be the way I'd think
19 you'd evaluate that type of area. I think also the DEIS may

PS2A1-86 20 be incomplete because I don't trust where the information is
21 coming from.
22 If someone has a monetary gain to obtain from
23 this pipeline going through because they didn't meet all the
24 requirements put up by FERC, then I think the information
25 could be biased and not completely even-keeled. And so that

PS2A1-83 Waterbody crossing methods and proposed mitigation are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A1-84 It is common for applicants to make route adjustments during the environmental review process, prior to a pipeline being authorized by the Commission. Re-routes filed after issuance of the draft EIS are discussed in the final EIS.

PS2A1-85 See the response to comment PS1A1-7 regarding cultural resource survey personnel.

PS2A1-86 See the response to comment LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 addresses that. I have other items, but they're not
2 addressing just the DEIS.

3 MR. CRAWFORD: I'm Paul F. Crawford.

4 MS. VEST: And Alison. Middle name Crawford,
5 last name Vest, like you wear.

6 MR. CRAWFORD: I am a landowner along the
7 proposed pipeline. My address is 209 Three Brooks Lane,
8 Rocky Mount, Virginia.

9 MS. VEST: It's 209, and then Three written out,
10 Brooks Lane. (Reading the following) This is "Attention:
11 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. My name is Paul F.
12 Crawford, and I'm a landowner in Franklin County, Virginia,
13 where Mountain Valley Pipeline is proposing to build a 42"
14 underground high pressure gas pipeline.

15 "One of the proposed routes is being surveyed
16 across my property located at 209 Three Brooks Lane, Rocky
17 Mount, Virginia 24151. My property consists of 23-plus
18 acres that myself and my deceased wife purchased and began
19 making our home in 1965. Below I will list my main
20 oppositions to the pipeline. I'm absolutely opposed to this
21 pipeline.

PMSA1-87

22 "Number 1. The largest area of what has been
23 surveyed on my property is wooded/forest with a 150-foot
24 right-of-way while building and to build, I will not see
25 this area fully revived in my lifetime. I spent all my life

PS2A1-87

See the response to comment FA15-5 regarding impacts to forests.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		47
PS2A1-87 cont'd	1	making this property a preserve.
	2	"2. The surveying also goes across a creek that
PS2A1-88	3	feeds into Blackwater River and could potentially cause
	4	water and wildlife contamination there, and on my property.
PS2A1-89	5	"3. The finished pipeline and destruction the
	6	construction causes will be a distraction to the Japanese
	7	garden which is visited by garden groups each year on my
	8	property. They come to see the numerous statues and
	9	abundant rhododendron that make up the garden. The garden
	10	is also a memorial to my wife of fifty years since her death
	11	in 2011.
	12	"4. I feel the construction of the pipeline and
	13	upkeep will cause an erosion problem on my property. Both
	14	the western and eastern slopes that have been surveyed are
	15	extremely steep, and with the number of trees they will have
	16	to remove, this is almost inevitable.
PS2A1-90	17	"5. I feel it will lower the value of the estate
	18	I've built up over the past fifty years, possibly as much as
	19	30%.
PS2A1-91	20	"6. Land area surveyed by the Mountain Valley
	21	Pipeline is marshy and prone to standing water as it is the
	22	basin for many surrounding acreages. The area was
	23	previously denied by the land erosion department to build a
	24	pond because of the large drainage of water from the eastern
	25	and western slopes of the property.

PS2A1-88 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PS2A1-89 See the responses to comment letter IND1020.

PS2A1-90 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-91 Pipelines can be constructed within marshes.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-92

1 "7. Actual pipeline will be within approximate
2 400 feet of my home, would destroy the safety I have felt
3 living alone since my wife passed away. The blast line for
4 this pipeline is a quarter mile on either side, which totals
5 a half mile. My home and myself would be obliterated.

PS2A1-92

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A1-93

6 "8. I have made my property an animal sanctuary,
7 allowing very little hunting over the years. The property
8 is home to many deer, wild turkey, raccoon, possum, fox,
9 bobcats and countless migratory birds which stop during
10 their migration on my pond. The animals and their homes
11 will be disturbed and destroyed by the pipeline.

PS2A1-93

See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

12 "Please do not allow Mountain Valley Pipeline to
13 destroy the home and property I have built and put my life
14 into for the past fifty years."

15 MR. BUFORD: Guy Buford. I own land along the
16 proposed pipeline. Address is 985 Iron Ridge Road, Rocky
17 Mount, Virginia 24151. I'm just gonna give you a
18 landowner's perspective of this thing.

19 First of all, I wanna say, FERC is their own
20 federal agency fully funded by fees collected from members
21 of the natural gas industry. FERC and MVP have an
22 interesting relationship. It appears to be much like the
23 fox guarding the henhouse.

24 Following along with me as I wade through this
25 relationship and development process. MVP first notified

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 landowners in north of Franklin County by mail in
2 September/October 2014. Well, they proposed pipeline
3 required passage through their lands. And MVP's intent to
4 make a pre-filing applications at FERC in October 2014.

5 Thus began the inundation of land owners with
6 requests for permission to survey their land, sketching and
7 incomplete mapping, volumes of confusing and disorganized
8 data pertained to the project. FERC and MVP communicated
9 back and forth with environmental questions and answers of
10 the volume of disorganized information accumulated. This
11 continued for a year of sketchy map and data revision during
12 which landowners began to vaguely grasp the scope of the
13 project and its impact.

14 How were we to find out specifically what was
15 going on? MVP filed a formal application with FERC in
16 October 2015 with it still fluctuating in data and it

PS2A1-94

17 continued in disorganized incomplete condition. So here we
18 are today with irrelevant and premature DEIS that does not
19 agree with the current plan and cannot receive a reasonable
20 review with any time allotted.

21 We got -- the people are expected to make our
22 final decisions and comments on this DEIS, a project that is
23 still incomplete and changing. This is not reasonable.

PS2A1-95

24 During these two years of project development, we, the
25 people, and various other entities have highly knowledgeable

PS2A1-94

The FERC is funded by the United States Congress, “which has no relationship to the number of approved pipelines or quantity of gas being transported” (Delaware Riverkeeper et al. v FERC No. 16-416 D.D.C Mar. 22, 2016). See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS2A1-95

See the response to LA5-1 regarding stakeholder comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		50
PS2A1-95 cont'd	1 and well-credentialed people have submitted numerous 2 relevant and some very detailed comments about the project 3 and the mountainous terrain through which it proposed to 4 pass. Yet there's little evidence of any of this in the 5 DEIS, or that they were even considered. It seems that we 6 the people are not a part of the process. Perhaps time will 7 tell otherwise.	
	8 MR. WRAY: I am a landowner along the pipeline 9 route. It's Alvin Wray. And my address is -- well, the 10 farm it's coming through is 703 Wades Gap Road, Callaway, 11 Virginia.	
PS2A1-96	12 Well, like I said, I'm a farmer. This will 13 destroy our business pretty much. It's coming down through 14 the middle of our best pasture, best hayfield. We feel it's	PS2A1-96 See the response to comment IND36-2 regarding farming.
PS2A1-97	15 gonna disrupt and contaminate the aquifers and wells on our 16 property, as well as having impact on the streams and rivers 17 that eventually flow to Smith Mountain Lake.	PS2A1-97 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the responses to comment letter CO14 regarding Smith Mountain Lake.
PS2A1-98	18 It'll negatively impact our cattle production 19 during construction and limited use of our land for future 20 cattle business by not allowing heavy equipment or certain 21 types of farming over the pipeline area. It's gonna	PS2A1-98 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding heavy equipment.
PS2A1-99	22 decrease our property values for resale; however, there's no 23 assurance from local government that real estate taxes will 24 be reflected in lower land values.	PS2A1-99 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
	25 Just the threat of a pipeline on our property has	

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 51

PS2A1-99 cont'd
1 lost a sale of property and rendered it virtually worthless.
2 I mean this was our retirement. We were planning to have
3 our kids build on it and live there and they don't want to
4 build near a pipeline.

PS2A1-100
5 We feel it's not being built for public use, but
6 for private corporations for profit. If the pipeline
PS2A1-101
7 explodes, it would cause complete destruction of the area of
8 over 1,000 feet on each side of the pipeline, the blast
9 there. It would cause complete destruction of the
10 mountains. Cause fires, you know, wouldn't be put out.
11 Local fire departments don't have any way to handle fires
12 like that. An explosion would annihilate property and
13 persons within that zone.

PS2A1-102
14 MVP has not assumed any liability for death and
15 destruction in the event of an explosion. In fact, has
16 asked the landowners to sign easements which would hold them
17 harmless in such an event. Proposed easements are biased in
18 favor of the pipeline and not the landowner. And we feel
19 that it's just gonna, it's not for the good of everybody.
20 It's just for the good of the private companies that want to
21 build this pipeline. It's not -- this gas is not gonna help
22 our county in the least, that we can see.

PS2A1-103
23 MR. SIMPSON: I am not a landowner. My name is
24 Jeremy Simpson. I've got three basic concerns. I'm
25 concerned about conflict of interest on the decision tree.

PS2A1-100 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A1-101 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PS2A1-102 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A1-103 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding a decision on the projects.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		52	
PS2A1-104	1 I've got a concern about the persinious rex, which is the 2 Virginia log perch, and how sedimentation from this project 3 might affect Virginia's endangered species of fish. And I'm 4 concerned about risk management. I would like to see risk	PS2A1-104	Threatened and endangered species are addressed in section 4.7 of the EIS.
PS2A1-105	5 management planning for pipeline for identification of 6 event, as well as emergency response to any sort of event 7 for the pipeline.	PS2A1-105	See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.
	8 MR. HAYNES: I am a landowner along the pipeline 9 route. My name is James G. Haynes, Jr. And it's 844 10 Bonbrook Mill Road, and that's Rocky Mount address.		
PS2A1-106	11 It is ludicrous in this day and age, with the 12 technological advances in renewable energy to consider 13 destroying the environment fifty feet wide and over 300 14 miles long to accommodate a fossil fuel delivery system, 15 especially one sustained by fracking. Today, energy can be 16 generated using common construction items such as siding, 17 shingles, and other roof materials and paint, to name a few.	PS2A1-106	Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.
PS2A1-107	18 As a landowner that stands to lose several acres 19 of productive open land, as well as more of woodlot acreage, 20 I am strongly opposed to this and any project of this type. 21 My family has owned, paid taxes on, and maintained our 22 homestead for over fifty years. My children and 23 grandchildren who inherit this will continue with the same 24 pride and stewardship. 25 Absolutely do not allow this project to proceed.	PS2A1-107	Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 53

PS2A1-108 | 1 Let's use the monies involved to pursue more viable,
2 renewable sources. Thank you.
3 MR. CARTER: My name is Michael Carter. And I am
4 power of attorney for a landowner on the route. This is my
5 wife.
6 MS. CARTER: I've talked to the other room, so
7 I'm just here to listen.
8 MR. CARTER: I'm a concerned citizen of Franklin
9 County. I'm against the MVP, the Mountain Valley Pipeline
10 has not proven domestic use. Paul Friedman, your
11 representative stated in Elliston, Virginia, last year, he
12 would not entertain any comments if this gas was for export.
13 Shortly after the round of scoping hearings, a
14 partner bought into Mountain Valley Pipeline. This partner
15 strictly in the business of exporting gas. The proposed
16 Mountain Valley Pipeline will be the most environmentally
17 damaging project ever considered for Franklin County. The
18 economy here is based on agriculture and tourism. Our
19 motto, the "Land between the Lakes". Water is our most
20 valuable asset.
21 Mountain Valley Pipeline proposes to cut over 140
22 streams in our county, starting at the northeast slopes of
23 the Blue Ridge Mountains. This egregious company plans on
24 crossing Tier 1 streams all the way down the Blackwater
25 River watershed. Many of the slopes they have mapped are 90

PS2A1-108 Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS2A1-109 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A1-110 After pipeline installation underground, the right-of-way would be restored and revegetated. Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Agriculture is addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. Waterbody crossing are addressed in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		54
PS2A1-110 cont'd	1 degrees or greater, prone to erosion landslides. Where is 2 the due diligence?	
PS2A1-111	3 Virginia State DEQ is already stated publicly 4 that MVP has numerous inconsistencies and inaccuracies in 5 the DEIS. The Army Corps of Engineers has not issued 6 permits due to MVP's poor paperwork and inaccurate 7 reporting. The DEIS was released prematurely. The route is 8 still changing in Franklin County. Contrary to the claims 9 in the DEIS, the route has not been properly surveyed.	
PS2A1-112	10 What about the Roanoke logperch in the Pigg 11 River? This is a highly endangered species. Is it to be 12 ignored? There are at least four very important Native	
PS2A1-113	13 American archeological sites identified on the route in 14 Franklin County. They include the Wray property off Dillons 15 Mill Road, the Bernard property off Grassy Hill Road, 16 Wendolyn Murray Flora's property at the base of Cahays, and 17 Dale Angle's property on Iron Ridge Road. Several of these 18 have been in Phase 2 studies and two are federally 19 recognized. 20 These significant Native American heritage sites 21 must be protected. No mention in the MVP volumes of "smoke 22 and mirrors" malfeasance are planned on purpose. MVP's 23 response? I haven't seen a response.	
PS2A1-114	24 FERC is already aware of the growing 25 sedimentation issues involving Smith Mountain Lake. If you	

PS2A1-111 Since the COE is a cooperating agency for review of the MVP, it is customary to postpone permit decisions until after completion of the FERC EIS process. See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS2A1-112 Section 4.7 of the EIS states that Roanoke logperch can be found in the Pigg River and provides a discussion of potential impacts.

PS2A1-113 Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS2A1-114 See the responses to comment letter CO14 regarding Smith Mountain Lake. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS and in the response to comment FA11-15.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

	20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016	55
PS2A1-114 cont'd	1 grant MVP a permit to construct an unnecessary export 2 pipeline, you are dooming our lake. All of the runoff from 3 the stream damage caused by this project will end up in the 4 Blackwater River watershed and ultimately Smith Mountain 5 Lake. 6 This will cause major damage and loss of huge 7 revenues our county has come to depend on for our tax base. 8 America is watching. Need I remind you of the Dakota Access 9 Pipeline in the Standing Rock Sioux? I urge you to rule on 10 this project swiftly with no permit. Thank you.	
PS2A1-115	11 MR. CLEMMONS: Mark Clemmons. I'm not a 12 landowner. I'm against the Mountain Valley Pipeline. All 13 that is, is for a company to get outta paying shipping, both 14 rail and freight. It serves no beneficial purpose and it 15 destroys the water and the environment. 16 I originally got people in West Virginia, the 17 coal counties of West Virginia. I've seen what fracking and 18 pipelines and coal companies do to the water up there. You 19 can't find a decent drop of water in no county up there. 20 I'm talking McDowell, Mingo, Logan, Wyoming. You can't even 21 take a bath.	PS2A1-115 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.
PS2A1-116	22 So I'm strictly against this pipeline. It is not 23 needed. Period. And it's a lot of people, it's in the 24 pockets of the pipeline and all and that's why it's going 25 on. If people had any decency, they'd stand up and stop it.	PS2A1-116 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.
PS2A1-117		PS2A1-117 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 56

1 Any integrity about 'em. People that forward or back it,
2 they the lowest in my opinion, turn it into a septic tank.
3 I'm strictly against it. It is not needed, sir.
4 No purpose whatsoever. Just run gas from West Virginia to
5 the ocean to put it on a ship to supply China and India.
6 That's all it is. Corporate greed. Trying to get outta
7 paying shipping to trucking companies and rail. It needs to
8 be stopped. Thank you. I'm done.
9 MS. FRITH: My name is Linda Frith. I live at
10 580 Wildwood Road, Boones Mill. I am really concerned about
11 the safety if this pipeline comes through. If it should
12 happen to explode, I won't be here anymore. I am worried
13 about gas leaking out of the pipeline and contaminating our
14 water supply and the creek that runs through my farm.
15 I'm worried about also the erosion because they
16 coming through a hill. And I have two building sites on my
17 land of 180 acres. I can't use these building sites now. I
18 can't sell them. I can't give 'em to my kids because they
19 don't want 'em anymore if the pipeline's coming.
20 I feel like this pipeline is for personal gain,
21 not public. It's going to devalue my property. And I
22 don't see why we should be shipping our resources to other
23 countries when we need them here. Everything is going to
24 shipped across the sea to Europe. And that's about all I
25 have to say.

PS2A1-118 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND179-2 regarding leaks within waterbodies.

PS2A1-119 See the response to IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS2A1-120 See table 3.5.3-1 for an updated discussion on the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-121 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-122 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-123

1 MR. BROWN: My name is Alfred L. Brown. I'm a
 2 landowner. I reside at 555 Flanders Road, Callaway,
 3 Virginia. The first thing is erosion. I'm worried about
 4 the erosion. It's gonna come down 2,000 feet from the top
 5 of the hill down to my bottom land. There's a map here that
 6 shows -- and the herbicide. I don't want any herbicides on
 7 my property, and they've said they put that in the contract,
 8 but they won't put a penalty clause to it.

PS2A1-123 See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS2A1-124

9 And I know what they'll do when this corporation
 10 is sold. They will turn around and there will be herbicide
 11 on my property. And a perpetuity clause. I don't agree
 12 with that. It probably applies, only good for fifty-five
 13 years. I understand it. And they want it for the rest of
 14 my life, and however the United States lasts.

PS2A1-124 See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: So you're talking about the terms
 16 of the easement agreement when you're negotiating with the
 17 company?

PS2A1-125

18 MR. BROWN: Right yes, sir. And the pipeline
 19 surrounding my property on the map here, it comes down, and
 20 my house is the shape like this here. My house is here, and
 21 it comes down -- I'm surrounded on two sides of the
 22 property, comes right through the middle of my property and
 23 they're not offering me enough money for the property,
 24 because the property's gonna be devalued on both sides.
 25 They want to put a right-of-way through my

PS2A1-125 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

58

1 property for other people up the road, and they want me to
2 be responsible, did I understand about the contract, making
3 sure nobody with 40,000 pounds go across that, and they
4 agreed to a certain degree if they would possibly fix that,
5 but we haven't come to an agreement on that. By the way,
6 I'm not a tree hugger. I believe in an imminent domain, and
7 I believe in this great country of ours. Thank you.

8 MS. GINGER SMITHERS: Ginger Smithers.

9 MS. GAYLE SMITHERS: And Gayle Smithers.

10 MS. GINGER SMITHERS: Yes, we are landowners.

11 We've got a lot of mileposts. The milepost, we have
12 several. One of 'em is 267.4 down to 267.9. And then we
13 have, let's see, pretty much 268.4 -- I don't know how I
14 should give you these numbers. From here all the way down
15 through there, so what do we do about that?

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: So it looks like it ends at 269.0?

17 MS. GINGER SMITHERS: Yes. But it comes all the
18 way across the road, too. We --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: So 269.1?

20 MS. GAYLE SMITHERS: Right there's the line, so
21 it's --

22 MS. GINGER SMITHERS: Our main gripe is with this
23 property. I'll get back to the numbers. I don't wanna
24 waste my time giving out numbers if I only got three
25 minutes. This main property here is, it's three big pieces

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-126

1 of property. But this is a cattle farm. This is a working
2 cattle farm. This has got a 130-plus cows on it. The cows
3 eat from the back, come down to the creek and drink and come
4 over to the other side. So they graze from one end to the
5 other. They've been doing this for forty years. This has
6 not happened because of the pipeline.

PS2A1-126

See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding cattle.

PS2A1-127

7 The way this comes through, it's cutting through
8 the property. It's gonna cut off the water source. We have
9 three sections of cows, three different types of cows.
10 There's a reason behind that, but we won't get into that

PS2A1-127

See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

11 either. We also have a watering system. There's a ram pump
12 down here in this creek that goes up to the top of the hill.

PS2A1-128

13 There is boxes up here, cement boxes that goes
14 along -- the ram pump pumps it up to the top of the hill, it
15 gets in the cement boxes, which is a watering trough that
16 has an overflow that goes to the next box to the next box to
17 the next box, and then empties back down into the creek.

PS2A1-128

See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

18 This pipeline thing is going around, it's cutting all that,
19 it's cutting the lines to our watering property, the
20 watering boxes going up to it, so that's destroying that.

21 We have all of our storage for our hay to feed
22 our cows, well, pretty much all of it, there's 700 rolls of
23 hay up here on top of the hill to feed these cows. All of
24 this is taking place right there at it, so it's cut
25 everything, so how are we gonna get up there to feed the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 60

1 cows, to get around the cows.

PS2A1-129 2 This coming down the driveway, which is a
3 terrible idea, turning off by the barn, there's not enough
4 room for hardly a tractor to go by there. There's not a
5 good access road. Everybody who's looked at it said that's
6 a bad idea. It goes down, crosses a bridge that's at a
PS2A1-130 7 creek. The bridge needs to be repaired.
8 When the creek gets up, it's much more powerful
9 than what the creek looks like it should be, but it's washed
10 out several times, and we've patched and patched and
11 patched. That's not a good place for any kind of cars to be
12 going over. They've got a line going right up through the
PS2A1-131 13 middle of where our cow pasture is.
14 We use this barn down here. This is the cattle
15 barn that we have to bring the cows to it for veterinarian
16 care, for shots. We use this -- this is pretty much the hub
17 of the location. And all this is going on around, it's been
18 cut up. I mean it's a complete and total mess.
19 So I have talked to the Mountain Valley Pipeline
20 agent several times, multiple times, and have gotten nowhere
21 with him. I talk to him, he takes notes, he never gets back
22 to me, never tells me what's going on. They take tests,
23 they never tell us any test results. I've asked for 'em,
24 don't ever get any of those back.
25 So a couple weeks ago, I was at home and caught

PS2A1-129 See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-130 See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-131 See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 one of the surveyors on the property and our bull was over
2 there kind of snorting at him, so I gave him a choice, get
3 in the car with me or get snorted at by the bull, so he got
4 in the car with me. I rode him around, I explained to him,
5 I talked to him.

6 He was one of the Mountain Valley Pipeline
7 surveyors. I had a better conversation with him than I ever
8 had with the agent. And he drew up a new possible proposed
9 route, which is longer, but it goes along the back of the
10 property so we could have a fence back here, but the cows
11 would still be able to eat from one side to the other,
12 because with that amount of cows, you need to be able to
13 have 'em eat that far.

14 MS. REILLY: My name is Carolyn Reilly. And my
15 husband and I are in the direct --

16 MR. REILLY: Ian Reilly. I'm just here with her.
17 Our milepost is 262.5 if this monstrosity goes through.

18 MS. REILLY: So I've given comments and I've
19 written comments and for this three minutes, I would like to
20 actually sit in silence with all of you, because I feel like
21 that is what FERC is doing by having a process just like
22 this of dividing up the people where we can't even hear from
23 each other and learn from each other as a community, that we
24 have to have our information sessions and I'm gonna sit in
25 silence. (silence from 2:01:35 to 2:04:00)

PS2A1-132

PS2A1-132

See table 3.5.3-2 regarding the commentor's parcel.

PS2A1-133

PS2A1-133

The commentor's silence is noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 62

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

2 MS. REILLY: Water is life.

3 MS. KELLEY-DEARING: It's Bridget, and then my

4 last name is Kelley-Dearing. What else do you need?

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Are you a landowner along the

6 pipeline?

7 MS. KELLEY-DEARING: No.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Then you have three minutes

9 to tell us your comments on the DEIS.

PS2A1-134 10 MS. KELLEY-DEARING: FERC cannot approve any

11 pipeline project that is absolutely not needed. This

12 protection is absolutely needed when a for-profit company,

13 such as EQT, is taking personal property, farms, homes and

PS2A1-135 14 businesses. The taking of private property through imminent

15 domain for private gain violates the law and the private

16 property traditions of Virginia. The MVP is not needed for

PS2A1-136 17 the following reasons:

18 Existing pipelines satisfy Virginia demands.

19 Also the reported natural gas storage has the capacity to

20 supply 71 mncf per hour which is a conservative amount

21 because not all gas storage is reported in Virginia. The

22 reversal and upgrades of existing pipelines such as the

23 Transco Mainline Pipeline is expected to add the capacity of

24 254 mncf per hour in 2017. The WB Xpress project would add

25 73 mncf per hour beginning in 2018.

PS2A1-134 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A1-135 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A1-136 Existing pipeline systems as an alternative to the MVP was examined in section 3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		63	
PS2A1-137	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<p>Therefore, natural gas in our region exceeds peak demand in the anticipated natural gas supply capacity on existing and upgraded infrastructure as sufficient to meet maximum natural gas demand from 2017 through 2030.</p> <p>We must have a determination of need for a new pipeline infrastructure, which includes a detailed integrated analysis of natural gas supply capacity and demand for the region as a whole. All the pipelines.</p>	PS2A1-137
PS2A1-138	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<p>FERC should not properly account for private change and its environmental impact assessment. The EPA wants potential emissions from burning the natural gas transported by the pipelines to be factored in assessments. President Obama's administration has called on federal agencies to consider the climate impacts of their projects.</p> <p>The EPA cited the council of environmental quality, CEQ, recently issued final guidance on GHG emissions and how Federal agencies should weigh these emissions in reviews conducted under the national environmental policy act, NEPA. The guidance specifically uses end-use product combustion as an example of an indirect emission that should be calculated for each project under consideration.</p>	PS2A1-138
PS2A1-139	23 24 25	<p>The environmental assessment of the MVP must comply with this request. Additionally, the MVP, if approved, would lock us into dependence on natural gas for</p>	PS2A1-139

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

See the response to comment FA15-10 regarding emissions due to consumption of gas. GHGs and climate change are discussed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

Wetlands and waterbodies are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy. Information regarding the CWA is provided in section 1.5 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2A1-139
cont'd

1 eighty years, the life of the pipeline, all for a for-profit
2 company.
3 The MVP will impact our wetlands and water bodies
4 and must follow the Federal Clean Water Act. Water is life,
5 and in this Virginian's mind, much more important than
6 natural gas. Most scientists agree that methane is worse
7 for our atmosphere than CO2. We must move off of natural
8 gas and onto renewable energy.

PS2A1-140

PS2A1-141

PS2A1-142

PS2A1-143

PS2A1-144

9 The MVP will lower property values, take property
10 from law-abiding Virginians, put us at risk of explosions,
11 threaten our water safety and keep us dependent on natural
12 gas for decades. The MVP will carry fracked gas which has
13 all but destroyed the water in the Clarksburg and Doddridge
14 County region of West Virginia. I do not want to burn a
15 natural gas fuel at the expense of our neighboring state,
16 West Virginia.

17 Finally, my brother, Sean Patrick Kelley, lives
18 less than two miles from where the MVP will cross, bottom
19 creek road in the Bent Mountain area. He lives at 9502
20 Patterson Drive, Bent Mountain, Virginia. I strongly oppose
21 the MVP. We must be more forward-thinking for the health of
22 our children and our planet.

23 (8:01 p.m.)
24
25

PS2A1-140 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A1-141 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A1-142 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A1-143 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A1-144 The commentor's statements are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

65

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Rocky Mount, Virginia

16 Date: November 2, 2016

17 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
18 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
19 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
20 of the proceedings.

21

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A - ROOM 2

1 BEFORE THE
2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 - - - - - x

4 IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.

5 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC : CP16-10-000

6 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT : CP16-13-000

7 - - - - - x

8
9 Franklin County High School
10 700 Tanyard Road
11 Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151

14 Wednesday, November 2, 2016

15 The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping
16 Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 5:00 p.m.,

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. LUSBY-DENHAM: I am Anne Lusby-Denham. I'm a
3 minister's wife and retired social worker mental health
4 therapist. I stand in strong opposition to the proposed
5 Mountain Valley Pipeline for many reasons, a major one is
6 that Virginia's coastland is second only to New Orleans in
7 its vulnerability to sea level rise. As a result, the
8 stakes are just too high for our state to continue pursuing
9 costly infrastructure such as pipelines that will make
10 climate change worse.

11 Robert Howarth from the Department of Ecology and
12 Environmental Biology with Cornell University states: "When
13 methane emissions are included, the greenhouse gas footprint
14 of shale gas is significantly larger than that of
15 conventional natural gas, coal and oil." Because of the
16 increase in shale gas development over recent years, fossil
17 fuel emissions rose between 2009 and 2013, despite a
18 decrease in carbon emissions. If we continue the present
19 course of fracked gas pipelines, this dangerous trend will
20 continue.

21 I ask FERC representatives why would your agency
22 continue to approve projects such as the Mountain Valley
23 Pipeline that will end up wreaking havoc on our state, our
24 country and our planet? Surely everyone connected with FERC
25 must have family members? Perhaps children and

PS2A2-1

PS2A2-1

The projects are not near the coastline. Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 grandchildren whose lives could be affected by your
2 decisions. I have two grandchildren and a third on the way,
3 and they are very much on my mind as I speak today.

4 Although I feel that what I've already stated is
5 the most compelling reason to oppose this pipeline, there
6 are additional reasons. A 42" pipeline has never been built
7 in the State of Virginia, and particularly through land that
8 is full of karst geology, is mountainous with many forested
9 areas. In the event of a rupture, a pipeline of this size
10 would overwhelm emergency personnel in Franklin County and
11 surrounding counties as well.

12 The potential for a catastrophic explosion and
13 subsequent fire in the forests and mountains of southwest
14 Virginia would be devastating and, for the most part,
15 uncontrollable. And I don't know if I can pull it up, but
16 -- well, anyway -- there are hundreds of pictures online of
17 explosions from 24" pipeline explosions. It is not -- the
18 company cannot give us any assurances that the gas would be
19 shut off before major damage is done. It's not realistic,
20 and we know that many ruptures and explosions have happened
21 and are happening right now.

22 The other major problem with ruptures is damage
23 to the water supply. As many others have pointed out, water
24 is life, and none of us can live without it. There will be
25 risks to our water supply if this project goes through, and

PS2A2-2

PS2A2-2

See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch pipelines in karst terrain. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response. See the response to comment PS1B1-15 regarding the potential impact radius and MLVs.

PS2A2-3

PS2A2-3

Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 the project should be shelved for this reason alone, but as
2 I've already stated, there are plenty of other risks,
3 particularly increasing climate change which affects
4 everyone, not just Virginia, as well as explosions that
5 could be devastating.

PS2A2-4

6 I would also like to touch on the subject of
7 imminent domain, especially imminent domain that is taken
8 for corporate profit rather than public benefit. This gas
9 damages our land as it goes on its way to markets abroad.
10 It upends the lives of farmers and homeowners along its
11 pathway, ruining their property values and despoiling the
12 natural beauty. If this were your land and your loved ones,
13 would you consider this project to be worth it? Given all
14 the risks and problems I have mentioned. I hope and pray
15 that it is not.

16 MR. DUDLEY: My name is Kenneth W. Dudley. My
17 address is 229 Beverly Hills Circle, Rocky Mount, Virginia.
18 I own some property off of Old 220 in the Countryside
19 subdivision, which is one of the nicer subdivisions in the
20 county. I purchased the property in October '14, and at the
21 time, I didn't know the line was gonna be in the area or
22 whatever, and after closing on it, sometime thereafter I
23 found signs kept popping up, "no pipeline" whatever, so --

24 A friend of mine, we had purchased it together,
25 and I advised her of this and we had planned to build

PS2A2-4

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. Mountain Valley has not proposed to export natural gas. The Commission would decide about the public benefits of the projects. Visual impacts are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 somewhere around \$200- or \$300,000 house and we found out
2 since that the pipeline was gonna be within approximate
3 three-tenths of a mile of it and she's not interested in
4 building the house.

5 And I got an assessment from the tax people. It
6 was assessed at \$52,500 and I went before the assessment
7 board and told 'em the history about it, what I'd done and
8 what I -- and they lowered the assessment value to \$36,900,
9 so there was a \$15,200 decrease in value, and that's what
10 the county appraisers did. So my contention is, and here's
11 the plat, the lot that I purchased off of Retreat Road, the
12 back of it.

PS2A2-5

13 My contention is that I haven't received anything
14 other than this notification in the mail at that address. I
15 feel like I will incur some damages from this. I would --
16 hopefully someone would contact -- I got an address of who
17 to call with a contact, so I feel like I start doing some
18 negotiating with them or so. That's my main concern. And

PS2A2-5

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values. If you are not an affected landowner, you would not be sent notices from the FERC. However, FERC notices are published in the Federal Register, sent to local libraries and newspapers to be disseminated to the public; and are posted on the FERC webpage.

PS2A2-6

19 in addition to that, I'm formerly a State Game Warden, and
20 I'm concerned with wildlife habitats that this line and
21 equipment would destroy, you know, the beauty in the
22 environment and whatever. Basically, that's all I have to
23 say. I just want to thank you for your time, whatever.
24 Thank you.

PS2A2-6

See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

25 MS. BERNARD: My name is Anne Bernard, and my

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 husband and I have lived in our present home for almost
2 thirty-six years. We are both artists and appreciate the
3 beauty that surround us here in a manner that is akin to
4 worship. We are fortunate to have an uninterrupted view of
5 Cahas Mountain in our backyard that is peppered with cattle
6 and deer and wild turkey.

7 Though we have struggled to make ends meet in our
8 professions over the years, it was okay that we didn't
9 travel or have new cars because the beauty and serenity of
10 this place made it such a fabulous place to be. No matter
11 what else was going on in the world that was distressing to
12 us, at the core we were calmed by our home surrounds.

13 This is now under threat and in a very big way, a
14 tragic way, by the MVP polluters. We have had two years to
15 find out way more than the average person knows or
16 understands about pipelines, and the more one knows, the
17 more frightening and devastating this information is.

18 Let's start with the fracking process and how
19 destructive this has been for people in their environments.
20 We have gotten to know a couple whose ranch in Texas was
21 rendered worthless by fracking 100 miles away, their water
22 supply permanently destroyed. They still own this ranch,
23 but had to leave because one can't exist without water. The
24 amount of water needed for this process and polluted in this
25 process is on an unimaginable scale.

PS2A2-7

PS2A2-7

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 73

1 The amount of water this MVP pipeline would use
2 in their construction and maintenance of this project is
3 also on a similarly large scale. They would be crossing 140
4 waterways in Franklin County alone. We have seen evidence
PS2A2-8 5 of pipelines washed out and ill-maintained in Virginia
6 already and can only conclude that once the economic
7 benefits have been reaped here, the same fate awaits us.
8 The MVP representatives have lied to our faces on
9 numerous occasions. Their tactics for getting our
10 cooperative behavior have been deceitful and underhanded.
11 Frankly, we are disgusted by the government that would be
PS2A2-9 12 supportive and encouraging of such tactics, just whatever it
13 takes to get this gas to the coast where it can be sold to
14 foreign markets at a higher price. This would raise prices
15 here at home as we would have to compete with those prices
16 to even keep our own gas for our use in the states.
PS2A2-10 17 How is this convoluted scenario for the public
18 good? Which is the basis for the use of the imminent domain
19 laws. Our land is our greatest economic resource. We are
20 only a mile off a major highway, yet have an uninterrupted
PS2A2-11 21 view of the largest mountain in the county. I was recently
22 approached by a friend in the real estate at a party, and he
23 volunteered that our land value would plummet if this
24 pipeline comes through.
25 Would we be able to pay the increased insurance

PS2A2-8 Water resources are discussed in section 4.2 of the EIS. The pipeline would be buried below scour depth at stream crossings. The FERC and DOT require applicants to maintain their pipelines for the life of the project.

PS2A2-9 The FERC expects applicants to enter into good faith negotiations with all landowners. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A2-10 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain

PS2A2-11 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-11
cont'd

1 costs if such a project were forced on us? I teach art
2 three times a week in our studio here. My students would be
3 too afraid to be here weekly all year around if they were in
4 the immediate blast zone of a buried time bomb. Our church
5 is right across the road and has groups such as Frontier
6 Girls, Garden Clubs, in addition to weekly services that
7 would also be in the blast zone.

PS2A2-12

8 My productivity this year is vastly decreased as
9 I spend sleepless nights worrying about the entire
10 situation. My husband has COPD and already has suffered
11 illness requiring antibiotics as a result of trying to get
12 surveyors out of our land in the rain. We spend a lot of
13 time going to meetings and participating in projects just
14 off this matter. This has already severely impacted our
15 lives and would be the end of us, I fear, if we have to
16 endure watching everything that we have worked so hard for,
17 for thirty-six years, go to hell.

18 In closing, let me make perfectly clear that the
19 bottom line for me in the worry zone is the safety of our
20 water supply. The water underground is all connected and
21 flows together. When you start ruining our creeks and
22 rivers that flow to our wells and lakes, there is no coming
23 back from that. You have permanently destroyed our lives
24 and our ability to stay here. Where would we go? And who
25 would pay for our relocations? Watch out, FERC and MVP.

PS2A2-12

See the response to comment IND12-2 regarding homeowners insurance. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

75

1 You have hell to pay.

PS2A2-13

2 MR. BRITTON: My name is Kenneth D. Britton, Sr.
3 I received this from Mountain Valley Pipeline. It's a
4 packet saying how much they're going to pay me for access to
5 the property that they're going to put the pipeline on. And
6 I was just wondering how they came to the determination of
7 how much they were gonna pay us and have they contacted the
8 other three people that own the access to this? If not, and
9 what happens if I decline the use of my access road? That's
10 basically all I wanna know.

PS2A2-13

As stated in the EIS, the FERC urges Mountain Valley to use good faith negotiations to reach mutual agreements with landowners for its easements. We guess that the company uses real estate appraisals to come up with its easement offer.

PS2A2-14

11 MR. LEONARD: My name is Robert Leonard, and I'm
12 here this evening to convey to you my concerns regarding the
13 Mountain Valley Pipeline. The impact study, I read through
14 it. It is laced with rather shallow investigation. It is
15 largely self-applied, it's largely non-third party debted.
16 It's largely a lot of boiler-plate language. There's no
17 definitive, in a complete definitive along the whole pathway
18 of the pipeline. They have not studied it in any real
19 intimacy.

PS2A2-14

See the response to comment IND47-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

20 I can speak from a builder's perspective. I've
21 been building for thirty-five years. I've been in this area
22 for twenty-two years doing building. I've had to deal with
23 surface conditions and subsurface conditions, and even on
24 smaller projects and extremely small projects compared to
25 what we're doing here on the pipeline. I've had to deal

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-15 1 with sinkholes. I've had to deal with caves.
2 I've had to deal with, just in one project for
3 example, in 500 feet of a project, we've had to blast at the
4 cost of \$25,000 for the blasting, and then we literally had
5 to go in the same project and fill that project, the
6 sinkholes with 100 yards of concrete. That's within 500
7 feet. You're talking hundreds of miles. You have no idea
8 the extent of remediation that you're getting into.

PS2A2-16 9 And that's just one example. There's numerous
10 other examples of where I've had to similar things, so
11 there's -- I have not read in this document as to where
12 they're gonna take care of that in a very individualized
13 basis. Not to mention the steep slope. We've had to abide
14 by erosion and sediment regulations. We've had to abide by
15 DEQ regulations and all the things that go along with it.

16 The slopes that are spelled out in here far
17 exceed the things that we've had to work through on a local
18 level, and that we've had to remediate with actual sub
19 foundation systems and actual systems that retain in a
20 permanent way those steep slope conditions, this is not
21 addressed in that document in any real definitive way. It's
22 very cursory it's very boiler-plate.

PS2A2-17 23 Not to mention, there is inhabited bat caves.
24 They have no idea where those bat caves exist. I know that
25 firsthand. They're all over the place. They have not, not

PS2A2-15 Sinkholes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS2A2-16 See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS2A2-17 Bat surveys were conducted as described in section 4.7 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016	
77	
PS2A2-17 cont'd	1 that I've seen in this document, there's been no extensive 2 study to any of that.
PS2A2-18	3 At our property, which we are 0.29 miles from the 4 pipeline, it's off of our property line. We're in this 5 blast zone. We have built our homestead for twenty-two 6 years and we know firsthand that there's gonna be reduction 7 in our property value. All the sweat equity that I put 8 together with these two hands is now gonna be completely 9 washed out.
PS2A2-19	10 We have bee hives. The bees are endangered. 11 You're gonna take away all the trees that are up there 12 adjacent to our property, and the majority of what we 13 actually extract for our bee hives is actually tree pollen. 14 So they're, they're gonna have to fly longer, they're gonna 15 have to be more stressed out in getting their nectar and 16 their tree flow, so that's gonna impact them greatly.
PS2A2-20	17 Along with all the remediation and also all the 18 remedy from once they do the land clearing, it's not clearly 19 spelled out. It's very boiler-plate, it's very general. 20 They do not talk about specific conditions, again, with 21 steep slope, retainage and everything related to that. They 22 do not talk about the remediation or the mitigation of how 23 they're actually gonna deal with sinkholes which are 24 prominent through this whole entire area. 25 So there's no definitive plan for taking care of

PS2A2-18 See the response to comment PS1B1-10 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-19 See the response to comment IND76-1 regarding bees.

PS2A2-20 Specific mitigation measures for sinkholes are addressed in section 4.1.2.5 of the EIS. Section 2.7 of the EIS provides an overview of future plans and abandonment.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		78
PS2A2-20 cont'd	1 that. There is no definitive plan for, once they do install 2 the pipeline and then if the pipeline's ever abandoned, they 3 do not spell out how that's gonna be taken care of. It's a	
PS2A2-21	4 mixed-use pipeline, it's being sold as providing natural gas 5 and as a tapped-in facility, they can stock that natural gas 6 at any point in time, which again, takes away from the 7 socio-economic advantage that any pipeline's gonna offer any 8 community because they can stop that flow anytime they want 9 to so at a socio-economic disadvantage.	
PS2A2-22	10 And honestly, the reason they're coming through 11 this way is because it's a path of least resistance. It's 12 perceived in this area by the way the culture is, that they 13 do not have the means, they do not have the knowledge, they 14 do not have the wisdom to fight this. And you know what? 15 You're completely wrong. They do. Thank you.	
PS2A2-23	16 MR. LEONARD: My name is Ryan Leonard. And what 17 is your name? Harry. Harry, I come to you today as a 18 concerned citizen whose property line is 500 feet from the 19 proposed MVP. I'd like to begin by expressing my 20 disappointment in the fact that you were disconnecting 21 yourselves from the community by not conducting these 22 sessions in a public forum setting. 23 There are legitimate environmental concerns being 24 expressed by the citizens in the community regarding this 25 pipeline. My family and many homeowners in the area are	

PS2A2-21 The pipeline would only transport natural gas. Section 1.2 identifies the contractually obligated shippers for each project.

PS2A2-22 Mountain Valley picked its pipeline route to go from the point of production in Wetzel County, West Virginia to the delivery terminus at the Transco Station 165 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia

PS2A2-23 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. The sessions were open to the public, and all comments were placed in the public record.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		79
PS2A2-24	1 concerned that our household well-water source, the only 2 source of water for our family, may become contaminated or 3 damaged during the construction of this pipeline.	
PS2A2-25	4 In your draft EIS, it's mentioned several times 5 that blasting will likely not be necessary during 6 construction, I'm assuming from the comments that MVP has 7 given. This is a disingenuous statement because many 8 workers in the local construction industry will tell you how 9 often blasting is necessary and excavating due to our rocky 10 terrain. MVP's draft blasting plan states that they will	
PS2A2-26	11 conduct pre- and post-blast testing and inspections of wells 12 and structures. 13 Who will deem which homeowners are eligible for 14 these inspections and what oversight will be conducted 15 through Mountain Valley to ensure that they are following 16 this rule and other rules that they have stated in their 17 aforementioned plan?	
PS2A2-27	18 The safety of my family and other families in my 19 rural area is not being addressed as they should. If this 20 project is approved, we'll be living in the potential impact 21 radius or blast zone in the case of a gas explosion. As 22 such, the response time of the local emergency services 23 should play a large part in assessing the risk. And several 24 other properties along the route near us have the closest 25 emergency services of at least twenty-five minutes away.	

PS2A2-24/25 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Blasting is discussed in sections 2, 4.1, and 4.2.

PS2A2-26 See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PS2A2-27 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment PS1B1-15 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency services.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-28 | 1 Although a disaster is unlikely, this is a
2 problem that needs to be addressed. The Cave Conservancy of
3 Virginia has expressed their concerns over the environmental
4 impact as well, saying that the proposed MVP may cause the
5 caves and karst resources along the entirety of the proposed
6 route damaged. On-site evaluations of the karst areas
7 within the entirety of the footprint have not be performed
8 and this project is gonna result in permanent damage to the
9 numerous caves along the route.

PS2A2-29 | 10 Overall, I'm just asking that you protect the
11 environment and the people of our local community and all
12 communities along MVP's proposed route. Please consider the
13 importance of objective and neutral third-party assessments
14 in a decision that affects so many lives. I mentioned the
15 importance of objectivity because the draft EIS reads like a
16 piece of pro pipeline literature with statements that
17 present the facts about pipelines and then continue on to
18 favorably comment on them. Consider me, my loved ones and
19 everyone else whose lives you can affect. Thank you for
20 your time.

PS2A2-30 | 21 MR. NOVITZKI: My name is Anthony Novitzki.
22 Imminent domain to me is the power to take private property
23 for public use by a state, municipality or private person
24 authorized by the government. And the government is the
25 people. And public use to me, it says "requires the

PS2A2-28 Karst and caves is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS2A2-29 See the response to comment LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS.

PS2A2-30 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-30 | 1 property taken to be used to benefit the public." Now I
conf'd | 2 don't see how I am going to be benefited by this. I have a
3 small yard and the back is all private trees.

PS2A2-31 | 4 According to the map, they're gonna knock down
5 all my trees, and all I'm gonna be looking at an empty lot,
6 which I cannot, once they take it, I cannot do anything
7 with. They have to give me permission to put a barn up or
8 put trees or put anything back, which is ridiculous. And as
9 I said, I moved down here for the peaceful view, just not to
10 stare at an empty lot. And plus, just the construction

PS2A2-32 | 11 noise and damage, the decreased property values and I pay
12 taxes on the land, and how can MVP control what I do with
13 it?

PS2A2-33 | 14 And the dangers of gas leaks or explosions. I
15 mean it's ridiculous. I don't understand how they could do
16 this. I think FERC should just stop them. They could stop
17 this right now. They have to give them a certificate of
18 convenience by private companies wishing to provide
19 essential public services.

20 This is not an essential service to the public.
21 It's an essential service to them. They're making the
22 money. We're losing money. And plus, as I said, I'm losing
23 my peaceful view and all that stuff. And not to get
24 personal, I'm a two-time cancer survivor and right now I'm
25 facing a heart transplant. I don't need this aggravation.

PS2A2-31 As stated in section 4.8 of the EIS, landowners could not build structures or plant trees on the permanent easement. The company would compensate landowners for the loss of trees/timber.

PS2A2-32 Noise is discussed in section 4.12.1 of the EIS. See the response to IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-33 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. The company would pay landowners money for the easement.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

82

1 And I enjoy sitting in my backyard looking at my private
2 trees and property. I don't need it being destroyed by a
3 private company.

4 It's like Walmart all of a sudden decides they
5 wanna put a sign in my front yard. They're a private
6 company. How can they do that? And how can MVP do this?
7 Destroy a fifty-foot width? Of my land? And take away, as
8 I said, my privacy and everything that goes with it. It's
9 totally ridiculous, if you ask me. Is that my three
10 minutes. I think that's all my points.

11 Oh, and Franklin County, they can deny, too,
12 which luckily they did deny it, to give the rights to the
13 industrial park, even they're losing \$92,000, but FERC, I
14 don't think FERC makes any money on this. I know Franklin
15 County will, and I'm surprised they denied it. But at least
16 they're looking at the people, you know, instead of a
17 private corporation. And I think the people in this

18 instance have more say than a private corporation. It's my
19 property. I bought it, I pay the taxes, and I think I
20 should be able to do what I want with it.

21 And plus with MVP, they sent me a letter telling
22 me that they're going on my property, to sign this for a
23 commission. They never asked me. It didn't say, can we, or
24 can't we? It just says, "we're coming, sign this." So of
25 course, I didn't send 'em back, and they sent more

PS2A2-34

PS2A2-35

PS2A2-34

We urge the company to reach a mutually negotiated agreement with landowners.

PS2A2-35

Franklin County does not make any decisions about authorizing the project; that can only be done by the FERC. We urge the company to reach a mutually negotiated agreement with landowners. Safety is addressed in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 threatening letters. So I mean, don't tell me what to do,
2 ask me. What's the old thing, you know, kiss me before you
3 screw me? Anyway, that's I guess all I have to say.

4 I just think this should be stopped and for many
5 reasons. And especially the danger. So that's my two cents
6 for what it's worth.

7 MS. BOONE: My name is Jo Ann Davis Boone. I
8 live on Wirtz Road here in Franklin County. I'm a lifetime
9 resident of this county. We have a family history here
10 since the 1700s. Life is mostly agricultural. Farming,

PS2A2-36

11 dairy farms, gardening, to mention just a few. The impact
12 of MVP, includes, but is certainly not limited, to the
13 economic.

PS2A2-36

Socioeconomics are addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values. Safety is discussed in section 4.12 and water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

14 Land properties are decreasing in values because
15 of the MVP, resulting in a lowered tax revenue for our
16 county. No one wants to live in an area that carries a
17 daily minute-by-minute risk of devastation caused by threats
18 of explosions, water issues and other risks.

PS2A2-37

19 The majority of rural households have water
20 supplied by wells and springs. What happens when these
21 water sources are damaged to the point of poisoning to the
22 public?

PS2A2-37

Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Natural gas is mostly methane, which is lighter than air. In the unlikely event of a leak, the natural gas would dissipate into the atmosphere and not contaminate groundwater.

23 Concerning health, we all know that methane is a
24 by-product of natural gas and there's also a high risk of
25 water contamination. The health of our generation and

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-37
cont'd

1 generations to come will be affected by the Mountain Valley
2 Pipeline. There may not even be many future generations
3 because of the health problems to be experienced by the
4 pipeline. To coin a phrase generated by recent negative
5 events, All Lives Matter.

6 I could continue to list more devastating factors
7 associated with the pipeline, but I believe you have already
8 heard the majority of negatives aligned with your intended
9 fracking project. I can think of no positives. I implore
10 you to listen to those to be impacted by the pipeline and
11 deny approval of the deadly project. Thank you for your
12 time. I hope our concerns are not falling on deaf ears.

PS2A2-38

13 An after-comment would be, I thought I was coming
14 to an open forum for everybody to hear comments. Obviously,
15 this is not true. And I am truly, truly disappointed that
16 that has happened. Thank you very much.

17 MS. QUINN: My name is Linda Quinn, and I live at
18 199 Rockfish Bay Drive in Union Hall, Virginia. And in
19 addition to my general concerns related to the actual need
PS2A2-39
20 for the project, which I am doubtful that the duplication is
21 necessary, and the validity of privately owned corporation
22 using eminent domain to acquire land for the primary
23 purpose of transporting fuel for exportation, I believe the

PS2A2-40
24 proposed MVP is a risk to health and safety of not only my
25 family, but also the surrounding community.

PS2A2-38 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. All comments were placed into the public record; and can be read through the internet on the FERC's eLibrary system.

PS2A2-39 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A2-40 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 My home is located on the Blackwater River
2 Channel of Smith Mountain Lake. According to the water body
3 crossing tables from October 2015, Mountain Valley Pipeline
4 Resource Report 2A, the route of the proposed pipeline
5 crosses at least fifty tributaries emptying into the
6 Blackwater River and Smith Mountain Lake.

PS2A2-41

7 During the construction phase of the proposed
8 project, the disturbed ground would release sediment known
9 to contain heavy metals and radon into the waterways. The
10 regular maintenance of the pipeline would also result in
11 weed-treating chemicals flowing into the creeks, streams,
12 river, and ultimately Smith Mountain Lake.

13 In addition to recreational purposes, water from
14 the lake is being piped to the neighboring communities for
15 drinking water. The aquifer that supplies water for our
16 personal well and those of our neighbors may be impacted by
17 the water quality of the lake. The proposed pipeline route
18 between Rocky Mount and Union Hall follows Route 40, a
19 heavily traveled roadway.

PS2A2-42

20 Assuming that the proposed pipeline construction
21 requirements would be based on current population density,
22 it's highly likely that the wall of the pipe would be
23 thinner grade rather than the more substantial 4. An
24 incident along Route 40 could easily result in tragic loss
25 of life. The proposed pipeline route crosses from the north

PS2A2-41

See the responses to letter CO14 regarding Smith Mountain Lake. Mountain Valley would utilize erosion control measures to keep sediments on the right-of-way. As stated in section 4.2.1 of the EIS, Mountain Valley has prepared an *Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan*, which would be used in the event that unknown areas of contaminated soils are encountered during construction of the MVP. Impacts on drinking water sources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A2-42

The DOT regulations determine class pipeline thickness as described in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

86

1 side of the road to the south side of the road in the
2 vicinity of the intersection of Route 40 and Brooks Mill
3 Road which is Route 834. Rockfish Bay Road runs off of Kemp
4 Ford Road, Route 945, which intersects Route 40 east of the
5 Brooks Mill Road intersection.

6 Kemp Ford Road provides the only access into or
7 out of our subdivision, as well as for those residing along
8 Sterling Circle, Niver, Sandy Point, Balsam, Woodcutter,
9 Music Lane, Dillard's Hill and Standiford. Emergency
10 services for our area are provided by Glade Hill Volunteer
11 Fire, Glade Hill Rescue, which is west of Union Hall and
12 Glade Hill, and possibly Cool Branch, which is east of Union
13 Hall and Penhook.

14 The closest medical facility is Carilion Franklin
15 Memorial in Rocky Mount. In the event of a pipeline
16 failure, danger in the blast zone area would make sections
17 of Route 40 impassable, which would obstruct our access to
18 emergency assistance. An incident in close proximity to the
19 Brooks Mill Crossing would result in Kemp Ford area
20 residents being blocked off from evacuation.

21 Local fire and rescue have expressed concerns
22 about volunteer recruitment challenges. The added burden
23 and risks related to the possibility of a significant
24 pipeline incident may exacerbate the situation. It is
25 FERC's responsibility to carefully consider each permit

PS2A2-43

PS2A2-43

Mountain Valley would maintain access to landowners (see discussion of transportation in section 4.9 of the EIS). See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 requested. The Mountain Valley Pipeline is not in the best
2 interest of Franklin County residents, and is detrimental to
3 the environment by perpetuating the use of a fuel source
4 which is quickly becoming obsolete, and possibly even
5 against the treaty that was signed recently.

6 I'm against the Mountain Valley Pipeline and
7 respectfully request that you deny the permit. And I don't
8 know if anyone else has talked to you about the safety
9 issues, but my guess is there are other communities that
10 have the same problem.

PS2A2-44

11 MS. WERNER: Betty Werner. All right. I guess a
12 big concern is accuracy of the, whatever they call this,
13 report, the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement.
14 And I believe, on Page ES10, it talks about the MVP wants to
15 use 365 roads to access the construction sites along the
16 route, including 247 existing roads, 27 new roads, and one
17 new that's new and existing, whatever that means. But there
18 are 90 roads missing, and I wondered, are these private
19 driveways or simply bulldozers making a temporary road where
20 needed?

PS2A2-44

The final EIS has been revised to correctly summarize the use of access roads.

PS2A2-45

21 It seems that if this is a document of record,
22 then it certainly should have more accurate information. 90
23 roads missing is a big number, I believe. Again, the
24 economic need or the public need, I think I've checked
25 several. I'll leave this with you.

PS2A2-45

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. We are also appalled that no Virginia resource agencies agreed to be cooperators.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 And the environmental need, you know, for
2 Virginia, and as a Virginia citizen, I am appalled at no
3 Virginia agency is a cooperating agency to me. I know
4 that's not your area, evidently you ask them, but they
5 either just didn't respond or said, no, sorry, you're on
6 your own.

7 But this pipeline goes through a main -- a major
8 part of its route is in the State of Virginia, and to not
9 have a cooperating agency at that level, like DEQ and the
10 Department of Forest Service and Public Lands and for
11 Virginia lands, so several involved with the Appalachian
12 Trail Conservancy, and they have provided quite a few
13 comments based on environmental, specific to where it
14 crosses the AT, or the proposed crossings, I guess there's
15 several.

16 And again, public benefit, it says out there
17 that, or here too, if it's for public benefit, then it will
18 be issued a certificate for construction. It mentions in
19 the document several cases. I looked all through the back
20 to see, because I thought it was referenced in the back.

PS2A2-46

21 Some of the mitigation requirements that I think that MVP
22 has been negligent in providing to you or to be passed on to
23 us.

PS2A2-46

Mitigation measures are discussed throughout the EIS. Plans are listed in section 2.

PS2A2-47

24 Particularly in the water, the environmental area
25 of water impact, this is the size, the diameter of the

PS2A2-47

Water resources, drinking water and surface waterbody crossings, are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Depth of cover for the proposed pipelines are provided in table 2.4-3. Access roads are discussed in sections 2 and 4.8.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-47
cont'd

1 pipeline, which this company has never built a pipeline of
2 this size over hill and dale, and over 100 water crossings
3 here in Franklin County. Now, my understanding is that they
4 dig 10 feet deep and then put this in and then cover it with
5 gravel and all that.

6 Over 100, I think it's like 140 water crossings
7 here in Franklin County and for it not to have an impact on
8 our water system, our entire system of water that goes into
9 Smith Mountain Lake or our wells or our springs, to me is
10 not answered in here. The water crossings, particularly of
11 a pipe this size.

12 And then the access roads of hauling equipment to
13 build a trench to put things in this size in 10 to 50 foot
14 lengths of pipe, so there you have it. Concerned citizen.

15 MS. LIPSCOMB: My name is Hollis Lipscomb. I'm
16 concerned about the pipeline construction and the pipeline

PS2A2-48

17 being in the ground. I don't believe that we need another
18 pipeline. There is sufficient pipelines in the ground
19 already to transport this gas. There are certain
20 environmental concerns that I have in particular.

PS2A2-49

21 The pipeline construction will disturb river and
22 stream beds and will affect the wildlife in and around those
23 rivers and streams. And this will also affect the human use

PS2A2-50

24 of those water ways, both used and construction. The river
25 crossings have not been adequately planned. The drinking

PS2A2-48

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A2-49

Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PS2A2-50

See the response to comment FA11-15 regarding waterbody crossings.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-51

1 water resources have not been thoughtfully planned out of
2 the impact blasting and other construction techniques.
3 Additionally, the ongoing use of herbicides to
4 keep trees growing over the pipeline around the rivers and
5 streams will cause those herbicides to leach into the
6 waterways and will affect wildlife and humans. Nobody's
7 debating that fact. It's just that MVP thinks they can
8 mitigate it, and I don't see how. Ongoing use of herbicides
9 to keep the trees away from the pipeline will cause the
10 river and stream banks to erode and induce tremendous storm
11 runoff, to say nothing of the massive landslides down our
12 mountain.

PS2A2-52

13 Cahas Mountain is one of the most picturesque
14 views off the Blue Ridge Parkway and it will be destroyed
15 and flattened by this pipeline. Pipeline construction,

PS2A2-53

16 especially blasting, will impact our water quality at some
17 level. MVP has said that they will mitigate this, but I
18 don't see how a big water tank along the side of my house is
19 a mitigation for ruining the pure water that comes out of my
20 well.

PS2A2-54

21 Giving permit approval for MVP is the equivalent
22 of giving General Motors a private highway for their cars.
23 The government's taking private property for the corporate
24 benefit and profit, not the common good.
25 MS. YOUNG: My name is Regina Young. I have

PS2A2-51

See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PS2A2-52

The proposed pipeline route would avoid going over Cahas Mountain. Visual impacts are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS; including KOPs from Cahas Mountain.

PS2A2-53

See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS2A2-54

The government is not taking any land. We urge the company to reach mutual agreements with landowners. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

91

PS2A2-55 | 1 concerns about my property value. Will it go down? I'd
PS2A2-56 | 2 like to know what benefit this, for Franklin County, what
PS2A2-57 | 3 this is gonna bring to Franklin County? I'd like to know
PS2A2-58 | 4 about the blasting zone. How far we're gonna be able to
PS2A2-59 | 5 hear the blasting zone when it's blasting? Also, I'm
PS2A2-60 | 6 concerned about the hunters, artifacts that's here in
PS2A2-61 | 7 Franklin County. My brother is a big arrowhead hunter, and
PS2A2-62 | 8 a lot of 'em have been found on the Callaway side, Franklin
PS2A2-63 | 9 County side. I have concerns about deer hunting, people not
PS2A2-64 | 10 being able to deer hunt or what have you in the county.
PS2A2-65 | 11 Also, I'm a single parent and I had planned to
PS2A2-66 | 12 give this house to my kids when I deceased, but it -- I'm
PS2A2-67 | 13 mainly concerned about the property value, if it's gonna
PS2A2-68 | 14 head down and how much.
PS2A2-69 | 15 MS. OGLE: I am Jill Ogle. I have worried a lot
PS2A2-70 | 16 about the pipeline, stressed out a lot. I worry about my
PS2A2-71 | 17 family, grandkids, neighbors' safety. I don't think it's
PS2A2-72 | 18 need. Who needs a 42" pipeline? And I think it's all
PS2A2-73 | 19 because of greed from the large corporations. How would
PS2A2-74 | 20 anybody like to live in the blast zone, which we are living
PS2A2-75 | 21 in.
PS2A2-76 | 22 And what about it crossing 145 streams, you know?
PS2A2-77 | 23 We need our water and we don't need it to be poisoned. And
PS2A2-78 | 24 what about our beautiful mountains? The skyline is gonna be
PS2A2-79 | 25 destroyed. And just installing the pipelines. And they're

PS2A2-55 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-56 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County.

PS2A2-57 Noise impacts from blasting are discussed in section 4.11.2 of the EIS. As stated in the EIS, sound levels produced during blasting would be instantaneous, and would vary based on a number of factors, such as the type and amount of explosives used, distance of the NSA to the blast site, below-ground depth of explosives, and noise mitigation applied. However, typical construction blasting operation noise levels have been documented at about 94 dBA at a distance of 50 feet (FHWA, 2006). A worst-case scenario (i.e.; assuming no noise shield or barrier between the noise source and sensitive receptor), the nearest distance at which a sound level of 94 dBA attenuates to the 55 dBA criterion would be at a distance of about 4,500 feet. Because noise from blasting would occur infrequently and instantaneously for very short durations, noise impacts on the NSAs from blasting would not be significant.

PS2A2-58 Cultural resources are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS2A2-59 Hunting is discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS2A2-60 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-61 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-62 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A2-63 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment PS1B1-15 regarding the potential impact radius.

PS2A2-64 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS2A2-65 Visual impacts are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

92

PS2A2-66 1 not even using the really super thick pipelines.
2 It's safety -- I mean why endanger thousands and
3 thousands of people just because of greed? When they're
PS2A2-67 4 exporting it, you know, to India? It's not helping us at
5 all. It's just ruining our houses, the value of our
PS2A2-68 6 property. It's just a very bad thing because of large
7 corporation greed.
8 And the imminent domain, I mean, is, you know,
PS2A2-69 9 they're not a natural gas company, per se. They are just a
10 large corporation investing a lot of money. It's all about
11 the profit. It's all about the money. It doesn't matter.
12 They don't care who they kill in the process.
13 What about the earthquakes all the fracking
PS2A2-70 14 causes? And it's just gonna destroy, I don't know -- it's
15 gonna hurt our wellbeing, how 'bout that? And the
16 environment. And it's just a very bad thing. We have to
PS2A2-71 17 worry about landslides and, you know, of course, equipment
18 failure, and being blown to bits. Yeah, I think that's
19 something to worry about. Thank you.
20 MR. OGLE: Danny Ogle. My concern is living near
PS2A2-72 21 the blast zone and potential gas leaks. I'm also concerned
22 about hunters being around and the potential of maybe
PS2A2-73 23 shooting into the pipeline itself. I'm concerned about
24 terrorists, whether it'd be on American soil, Americans
PS2A2-74 25 themselves might do something because they're against the

PS2A2-66 DOT regulates pipeline design, including wall thickness, as explained in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PS2A2-67 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A2-68 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-69 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A2-70 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing. Earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS2A2-71 Landslides are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-72 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-73 Hunting is addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. Given the depth at which the pipeline would be buried (see table 2.4-3 in the EIS), a bullet used for hunting would not reach the pipeline.

PS2A2-74 Terrorism and security issues are addressed in section 4.12.4 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-75 1 pipeline, or from terrorists outside of the United States,
2 the disruption of life, your lifestyle, while it's being
3 installed with the all the equipment that's gotta be used,
4 the destruction of property and I have concern about
5 property value itself. You work years to establish your
PS2A2-76 6 home and fixing it up and then something like this comes
7 along and then it's not worth as much as it was, and it'll
8 be hard to sell with people not being interested, being that
9 it's so close to the pipeline.

10 It's not benefiting us to have it, not being able
PS2A2-77 11 to tap into it. It's all gonna be exported and that's all I
12 have to say.

13 MS. HAUSER: Elisabeth Hauser. My understanding
14 is that Franklin County is to serve as a conduit for a
15 pipeline crossing through Virginia and North Carolina to
16 South Carolina where the gas/oil will be put on the
PS2A2-78 17 international market, not for domestic use, with no benefit
18 to Franklin County whatsoever. Environmental concerns
19 outweigh any perceived pluses for Franklin County by far.

20 The pipeline would be going through, not over or
PS2A2-79 21 under creeks, streams and rivers. At those sites, the trees
22 must be kept permanently free of tree cover for the life of
23 the pipeline. Storm runoff and soil erosion will dirty the
24 streams. In addition, herbicides will be used to keep the
25 trees defoliated. Carcinogenic and otherwise harmful

PS2A2-75 After pipeline installation underground, the right-of-way would be restored and revegetated.

PS2A2-76 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-77 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A2-78 See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County. The MVP pipeline would terminate in Pittsylvania County, Virginia. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A2-79 As discussed in section 2.4 of the EIS, the pipeline would be 48 inches below the streambed in normal soil and 24 inches below the streambed in consolidated rock. Trees would not be permitted to grow within the permanent 50-foot right-of-way as their roots can compromise the integrity of the pipeline. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-79 | 1 chemicals will wash directly into our waterways, endangering
cont'd | 2 aquatic and wildlife, along with our very aquifers.

PS2A2-80 | 3 Many residents will sacrifice the peace they
| 4 found in living rurally by the ever-presence and noise of
| 5 large machinery and constant dust from same. Explosions
| 6 from dynamiting the bedrock to lay the pipe, explosions

PS2A2-81 | 7 which also may cause a disruption of present aquifers,
| 8 destroying water delivery and waste systems already in
| 9 place. When the ground moves, so does everything around it.

PS2A2-82 | 10 Not only those closest to the sites in question,
| 11 but all Franklin County residents will suffer a devaluation
| 12 of their property because of proximity to a potential danger
| 13 that occurs at least twice a week on national news. No one
| 14 wants an explosion, but they happen. So another expense for
| 15 all residents would be the increase of homeowners' insurance
| 16 costs.

PS2A2-83 | 17 Fresh water concerns outweigh all others in my
| 18 view. Leakage of any kind into our waterways and our
| 19 aquifers will taint our beautiful country forever, our
| 20 beautiful county forever. There is no undoing of that
| 21 problem once it occurs and the danger is ever-present during
| 22 construction and with further use.

PS2A2-84 | 23 Finally, there is but a bit of beautiful forest
| 24 and valley land left largely untouched by the "hand of
| 25 progress," which is our own sacred treasure. Deer, foxes an

PS2A2-80 The EIS addresses dust in section 4.11.1 and noise in section 4.11.2 of the EIS. Those impacts would be only temporary during construction. After the pipeline is installed and during operation peace and quite would return.

PS2A2-81 See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. Impacts on groundwater resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A2-82 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND12-2 regarding homeowners' insurance.

PS2A2-83 See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

PS2A2-84 Section 4.4 of the EIS discusses forest; section 4.8 addresses visual impacts. See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-84
cont'd

1 occasional bear, raccoons and songbirds have been able to
2 survive within these hidden pockets until now. When this
3 environment is scarred with man's machinery and the deep
4 woods necessary for continuation of species are erased,
5 there will be no more Franklin County.

6 The wildness, the very reason for attracting so
7 many nature seekers will be gone. All because some very
8 wealthy people want to cut through Franklin County on their
9 way to greater riches south of here. Thank you, but no.

10 MR. RHUDY: My name is Alex Rhudy. I live in
11 Roanoke, Virginia, and the pipeline is crossing my land at
12 Marker 253.1 and my biggest concern about the whole

PS2A2-85

13 pipeline, and I have quite a few, but my actual biggest one
14 is an evasive species called Japanese Stiltgrass, which is
15 just literally taking over all the agricultural land in
16 Franklin County, a little bit at a time.

17 You cannot drive on a road in Franklin County and
18 go a mile without seeing Japanese Stiltgrass. Animals won't
19 eat it. Horses won't eat it. Cows won't eat it. Sheep
20 won't eat it. Goats won't eat it. Deer won't eat it. The
21 only thing that eats it is a few bugs. And this is all
22 documented in the U.S. Forest Service description of
23 Japanese Stiltgrass. It also suppresses timber growth.

24 It has literally taken over -- anywhere the soil
25 is disturbed, it immediately takes hold. Each little

PS2A2-85

Table 4.4.1-4 in the EIS identifies Japanese stiltgrass as highly
invasive in Franklin County. See the response to comment
IND343-1 regarding invasive species.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

96

1 plant--and it is thick--can have 100 to 1,000 seeds on the
2 seed head, and they're kind of sticky and they stick to
3 animal's legs, so if a deer walks through it -- and this
4 stuff can grow up to 40" tall according to the U.S. Forest
5 Service. So I'm very concerned.

PS2A2-86

6 It's one of thirty-two invasive species listed in
7 the initial environmental impact statement. And I just read
8 through the way that they're planning to restore where the
9 cleared area and it is completely inadequate. They do not
10 realize what they're dealing with yet, because I've done
11 research with Landscape Enterprise, which is a wholesale
12 company that deals in all types of herbicides and so forth,
13 and the herbicide that is used to control Japanese
14 Stiltgrass is \$650 a gallon wholesale and on average, it
15 takes 16 ounces per acre.

16 That means that the cost of the herbicide alone
17 is over \$80 per acre to eradicate Japanese Stiltgrass. And
18 I have extensive experience with it on my own property. I
19 sprayed it with Roundup and it's back the next year, just as
20 thick, if not thicker. I have a cabin on my property and I
21 had a nice yard, probably, maybe an eighth of an acre that
22 was nice fescue grass and I kept it mowed regularly and the
23 Japanese Stiltgrass has choked out every bit of the fescue
24 on my yard. And I poisoned it last year and killed it, and
25 it's back this year.

PS2A2-86

See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-87

1 So I don't know what y'all's plan is about it,
2 but you need to address it far more than it's addressed in
3 the initial Environmental Impact Statement. And I
4 appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about it.

PS2A2-87

See the response to comment IND343-1 regarding invasive species.

PS2A2-88

5 MR. REILLY: My name is Ian Reilly. I'm an
6 affected landowner right about Milepost 262 1/2. Mountain
7 Valley Pipeline already disrespects us and our land. It
8 treats us with contempt when we deal with them. They've
9 been violating our property rights and ignoring our posted
10 biosecurity area signs that we have there to protect our
11 livestock and our property from any pathogens, anything that
12 they could be bringing in to our property, and have just
13 ignored 'em and really they don't seem to care.

PS2A2-88

We urge the company to reach mutually negotiated agreements with landowners.

PS2A2-89

14 It's endangering our livestock, as well as our
15 way of life. This pipeline would adversely affect our land.
16 It would destroy one of our most lush and verdant pastures
17 that we grow everything on. I'm essentially a grass farmer.
18 All of my animals live on grass and to remove that much
19 grass and land would -- we would no longer be able to
20 function as a business, as a farm to provide food for our
21 community or our family.

PS2A2-89

See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming.

22 And I mean that's taking away from us a very
23 fundamental right of property in order to build a
24 monstrosity to really and truly rape the land. I don't
25 think I have anything further.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 MR. ANGLE: Daniel Angle. I live at 1116 Iron
2 Ridge Road. And I'm not in favor of this pipeline. It's
PS2A2-90 | 3 going to ruin our waterways, also it's crossing places where
PS2A2-91 | 4 there's believed to be Indian encampments at one time.
PS2A2-92 | 5 There's a bee yard that's been there for fifty-five years,
6 it's going to hurt that.

7 And it's also -- it seems to me like it's a
PS2A2-93 | 8 private corporation for imminent domain. That shouldn't be.
9 And I just wonder if FERC is gonna let it cross a place
10 where there's been Indian villages and that sort of thing.
11 The waterways will be permanent damage and no fixing to
12 that. I just want y'all to know that I'm not in favor of
13 it. Thank you.

14 MS. TAYLOR: My name is Kathleen Taylor. I live
15 at 1305 Iron Ridge Road in Rocky Mount in Franklin County,
16 Virginia. I'm a former director of the Northeastern
17 Connecticut Conservation District and served on the Board of
18 the Putnam, Connecticut Wetlands Commission. In serving
19 these positions, I learned a great deal about the importance
20 of protecting our wetlands and natural resources. And the
21 guidelines established by FERC to do so.

22 I'm deeply troubled by the handling by FERC of
23 the Mountain Valley Pipeline project proposed by EQT and
PS2A2-94 | 24 NextEra. I believe FERC has failed to adequately review the
25 project before releasing its draft Environmental Impact

- PS2A2-90 Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.
- PS2A2-91 Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS. Mountain Valley's contractor recorded four archaeological sites (44FR398, 399, 400, and 404) on Mr. Angle's property. All four of these sites were evaluated to be not eligible for the NRHP.
- PS2A2-92 See the response to comment IND738-2 regarding the commentator's apiary.
- PS2A2-93 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.
- PS2A2-94 Wetlands are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

	20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016	99
PS2A2-95	<p>1 Study. Legal and environmental experts have identified 2 major gaps in FERC's analysis, including: 3 1. The core issue of whether the massive project 4 is needed to meet natural gas demand.</p>	PS2A2-95 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.
PS2A2-96	<p>5 2. Whether other alternatives, including energy 6 efficiency, solar and wind would be more environmentally 7 responsible sources,</p>	PS2A2-96 Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.
PS2A2-97	<p>8 3. A complete analysis of the cumulative 9 life-cycle climate pollution that would result from the 10 pipeline,</p>	PS2A2-97 Climate change and cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13.
PS2A2-98	<p>11 4. Any accounting of other environmental and 12 human health damage from the increased gas fracking in West 13 Virginia that would supply the pipeline. And finally,</p>	PS2A2-98 See the response to comment IND241-1 regarding induced development and comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.
PS2A2-99	<p>14 5. Through analysis of -- damn thorough analysis 15 of damaged water quality and natural resources throughout 16 the pipeline route. Lara Mack, the Virginia campaign field 17 organizer with Appalachian Voices, says this would be the 18 first fracked gas pipeline of this size to cross the 19 Alleghany and Blue Ridge Mountains. 20 Running a massive gas project through the steep, 21 rugged terrain laced with dozens of rivers and Tier 1 22 headwater streams is a perfect storm for major damage to our 23 water resources.</p>	PS2A2-99 Section 4 of the EIS provides an assessment of project-related impacts on a range of natural resources, such as water, vegetation, geology, soils, and wildlife. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter pipelines in mountainous terrain.
PS2A2-100	<p>24 FERC also fails to meaningfully address the 25 safety issues and other concerns so earnestly voiced by</p>	PS2A2-100 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

100

1 hundreds of homeowners and landowners across the route.

PS2A2-101

2 Next, experts at Massachusetts Bay Synapse Energy
3 Economics have concluded the supply capacity of the
4 Virginia/Carolina regions' existing natural gas
5 infrastructure is more than sufficient to meet expected
6 future peak demand. Two proposed and highly controversial
7 interstate pipelines are not needed. Because existing
8 pipelines can supply more than enough fuel to power the
9 region through 2030.

PS2A2-101

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. Non-environmental FERC staff may address the Synapse report in the Project Order.

10 The study concludes the Atlantic Coast Pipeline
11 and the Mountain Valley Pipeline, projects strongly opposed
12 by local governments, business and thousands of mid-Atlantic
13 neighbors would be financially beneficial to utility
14 companies and investors, while burdening customers with
15 higher bills to cover the costs of the unnecessary
16 construction.

PS2A2-102

17 These are projects that would damage our land
18 and water, take private property and destroy our public
19 recreational lands when FERC has not even determined if they
20 are truly necessary, and it makes it seem as if FERC is
21 valuing corporate profits over public welfare. FERC's
22 mandate is to protect our natural resources above all. I
23 demand that you do so.

PS2A2-102

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. The right-of-way would be restored and revegetated following construction (see section 2.4.2 of the EIS). Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The project would not take private property if landowners reach agreements with the company; in all cases they would be compensated for the easement.

24 MS. KUCHENBUCH: My name is Linda DeVito
25 Kuchenbuch, Floyd County, Board of Supervisor, Little River

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-103

1 District. I am here in support of the bordering counties,
2 three of which are Roanoke, Franklin and Montgomery in the
3 path of the MVP. I would like to go on record as saying
4 that as a Floyd County Board of Supervisor in the Little
5 River District, I am against the pipeline for the reason of
6 the geological formations that the pipeline will have to go
7 through in Giles, Craig and Montgomery Counties.

8 Plus there is an earthquake zone running through
9 Giles County in the area where the pipeline will be buried.
10 The karst geology of Giles County and parts of Montgomery
11 County with limestone and caves are very, very porous and do
12 not make good seating for a pipeline of this size and
13 magnitude.

14 I know that there are pipelines in our area that
15 are much smaller, some 8", some 12", but a 42" pipeline
16 going four feet under the ground in a zone of karst geology
17 through those counties does not make sense.

PS2A2-104

18 Also, the fracked gas that will be coming into
19 this pipeline is only set to maybe last 15 years, and as I
20 understand, most of this energy in the form of gas will be
21 shipped overseas and sold to European countries. This does
22 not gain any energy independence of the United States.

PS2A2-105

23 I would also like to go on record with the
24 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as saying we need to
25 look at wind and solar. I think if you were to come back to

PS2A2-103

The MVP pipeline route does not pass through Floyd County, Virginia. Earthquakes and karst are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch diameter pipelines in karst terrain.

PS2A2-104

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing and export.

PS2A2-105

Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

102

1 this area and say we wanted to put solar farms up, and
2 windmills, even though Floyd County rejected them a couple
3 of years back, I think with the reality of something like a
4 42" pipeline in the ground, you would find a much different
5 story. I thank you for your time this evening. Appreciate
6 it.

7 MS. DUDLEY: Gretchen Link Dudley. I'm from West
8 Texas. The region of West Texas is where all the fracking
9 is, and the fracking disturbed my water on my ranch so that
10 the water came out with oil in it, out of my spigots. So I
11 had to sell off my sheep and sell off my cattle. And also,
12 when I was a young teacher in Anchorage, Alaska, the
13 pipelines started through there, too, and that has been
14 nothing but trouble with so many leaks.

15 And I'm concerned about the pipeline here because
16 of the karst environment of the mountains. The mountains
17 are made up of shell and shale. And it really can't sustain
18 the grade that the pipeline will have to go on to climb
19 these mountains and come down the other end without terrible
20 erosion, which will then cause breakage, which will then
21 cause a lot of damage, and that's why I'm speaking and I'm
22 finished.

23 Because I don't believe that a motive is not the
24 answer, but a little bit of realistic thinking about low
25 lands for this pipeline, anywhere but through mountain

PS2A2-106

PS2A2-106

There is no fracking involved with the projects. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The MVP pipeline would transport natural gas; not oil. Earthquakes and karst are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-107

1 ranges. It's very dangerous. My husband's father was one
2 of the main developers of the original Colonial pipeline in
3 this country. And back then, your company was never going
4 through mountains. They knew better. And for this pipeline
5 to go through these mountain ranges, it's so dangerous.

PS2A2-108

6 With population so close that I really feel that
7 it -- you're really playing a very dangerous game here,
8 killing people. And even if your pipeline is exposed and
9 the terrorists get a hold of your roots, they'll blow 'em
10 up, we're gonna be in real trouble. And we can't --
11 terrorists are all over Europe now, and they're gonna get
12 here.

13 And I don't know how you can camouflage your
14 pipeline or cover your pipeline, but a 42" natural gas
15 pipeline -- the oil pipeline you see in Alaska the oil
16 dripping and it goes into the tundra. You can see where the
17 breaks are. But the natural gas, you put sulfur in the
18 natural gas so we could smell it.

PS2A2-109

19 We have a natural gas pipeline, a small one, by
20 our house that was built forty years ago, and we're not the
21 least bit worried about it, not at all. Because it could
22 not do that much damage. But a 42" pipeline and next to it,
23 another 42" pipeline? Because now it's gone from 50-foot
24 access to 500 foot that they're gonna clear. And that's for
25 more than one pipeline in that area. The 42" has an

PS2A2-107

See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch diameter pipelines in karst terrain. There are many existing pipelines crossing mountains; including the Rockies, Sierra, and Cascades. Safety is discussed in section 4.12.

PS2A2-108

Terrorism is discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-109

Mountain Valley would only install one pipeline in a cleared 125-foot-wide right-of-way; see recommended condition 4 in section 5.2. Mountain Valley would not clear a 500-foot-wide right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-110

1 explosion like one-sixteenth of Nagasaki. You're gonna blow
2 the heck out of Virginia. So I'm done. Okay.

PS2A2-111

3 MS. AVERILL: Trixie Averill. And I am here to
4 speak in support of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, because I
5 think it would be extremely advantageous to our area. We
6 have lived here since 1979 and it was a great place to live.
7 It still is, but we have lost so many businesses and so many
8 friends because of businesses leaving the area.

9 And either they were transferred or, you know, I
10 know a number of people -- right now it's happening, too,
11 who have lost their jobs. Because Norfolk Southern has left
12 and Advance Auto Parts, were two major employers in the
13 Roanoke Valley. And I also believe that it is imperative
14 that we have additional natural gas to attract new
15 businesses to our area that will help make up for, you know,
16 the loss of jobs.

17 So many of us, we have kids, we don't want 'em to
18 have to leave home to find work. We want 'em to stay here
19 where we can be with 'em, you know, and live near our
20 grandchildren. It doesn't always happen. But I do believe
21 that it is absolutely the safest way to transport gas.

22 I have friends who literally have a pipeline in
23 their backyard. It was there before they moved in, they've
24 bought the house, they've been there since, and his kids
25 grew up playing right next to it without a problem. The

PS2A2-110

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-111

Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 greenways around Roanoke Valley, there's pipelines all
2 through them, all over the place, everywhere you look.
3 There's a petroleum one right there, too, as well. As well
4 as gas. So I really hate to see the anti-crowd.

5 I mean I appreciate Mother Nature as much as the
6 next person, and Mother Earth. I do. I want to see
7 everything go well, but at the same time, we have these
8 natural resources for a reason and we should be free to use
9 them, and I do believe that it is absolutely in our best
10 interest to have the MVP built.

11 MR. MURRAY: Edward Murray. I live at 3820
12 Callaway Road in Rocky Mount, Virginia. I have seven
13 comments. I object to the format of this so-called hearing.
14 FERC representatives are apparently afraid to hear the
15 people speak publicly concerning this project. The previous
16 hearings, the FERC representatives blatantly lied about the
17 export of gas from this project.

18 There is no economic benefit to the construction
19 of this pipeline, except to the private for-profit entities
20 who will build it and export and sell the gas in foreign
21 countries. There is no public benefit to any of the areas
22 through which this pipeline is proposed to be built.

23 Property taxes will decrease and property values fall on
24 properties through which the proposed pipeline will go.

25 Infrastructure costs will rise as roads and

PS2A2-112

PS2A2-112

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. The sessions were open to the public; and all comments were placed into the public record.

PS2A2-113

PS2A2-113

Economic benefits are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding need. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS2A2-114

PS2A2-114

See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PS2A2-115

PS2A2-115

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-116

PS2A2-116

See the response to comment IND288-3 regarding road repairs.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

106

PS2A2-117 | 1 bridges are damaged during construction. Natural gas will
2 not be provided to any customers along the route, despite
PS2A2-118 | 3 the pretense that a tap is needed in Franklin County,
4 Virginia.
PS2A2-119 | 5 There should be no right to the use of imminent
6 domain for the private entities that are involved in this
7 private project. The use of imminent domain for this
8 project is in clear violation of the Amendment to the
9 Virginia Constitution that was approved in November 2012.
10 It is also in clear violation of the 5th and 14th Amendment
11 to the United States Constitution.
PS2A2-120 | 12 The environmental damage to the areas through
13 which this proposed pipeline will pass is potentially
14 catastrophic. Damage to the ecological habitat, the erosion
15 in mountainous areas, the increased use of herbicides to
16 maintain the route. These herbicides have been banned in
17 most civilized nations.
18 And most importantly the damage to aquifers and
19 water supplies, rivers, streams, water supplies to towns and
20 cities and to private wells. All of these damages are
21 potentially significant. The draft EIS statement that
22 environmental impact is limited is ludicrous.
PS2A2-121 | 23 The potential for disaster when, not if, the
24 proposed pipeline leaks or ruptures is beyond description.
25 Pipelines much smaller than this proposed project are

PS2A2-117 See the response to comment IND288-3 regarding road repairs.

PS2A2-118 As discussed in section 1.2 of the EIS, the MVP pipeline would be tapped to supply natural gas to Roanoke Gas, an LDC serving southwestern Virginia.

PS2A2-119 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A2-120 Our EIS concludes that the projects would not result in significant adverse impacts on most environmental resources (except for the clearing of forest). These conclusions are based on facts. Erosion controls are discussed in sections 2 and 4.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS2A2-121 FERC-regulated underground welded steel natural gas transportation pipelines rarely leak. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-121
cont'd

1 leaking and rupturing all over the United States. The local
2 fire and safety entities are not equipped to handle this
3 potential disaster.

4 The very fact that FERC is continuing to evaluate
5 this project clearly demonstrates that FERC has no concern
6 for the potential damage that this project will do
7 environmentally and economically and demonstrates that FERC
8 is basically an industry rubber-stamp for such projects.
9 Thank you.

PS2A2-122

10 MS. KIDWELL: My name is Susanne Kidwell. My top
11 concerns are global warming and water availability and
12 quality. People can't be healthy or live without clean air
13 and water. Fossil fuel production and use contaminate our
14 air and water. I understand that MVP must provide FERC

PS2A2-123

15 evidence of a need for the pipeline in Virginia. I'm not
16 convinced MVP has shown that a LNG pipeline is the way to
17 fulfill our energy needs.

PS2A2-124

18 Fracking and pipelines are not producing clean
19 energy and they're a threat to water supplies. My neighbors
20 and I want and need clean, sustainable energy sources. To

PS2A2-125

21 meet the challenges of global warming, we need to shift to
22 cleaner, sustainable energy now, not in twenty years or so,
23 but now.

24 I understand that a study was done in Virginia
25 that shows that with a minimum of alteration, existing

PS2A2-122

Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. The EIS addresses air quality in section 4.11.1 and water resources in section 4.3.

PS2A2-123

The MVP pipeline would transport vaporized natural gas not LNG. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A2-124

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS2A2-125

Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

	20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016	108
PS2A2-126	<p>1 pipelines are adequate for supplying gas in Virginia for the 2 foreseeable future. It appears that the major need the MVP 3 pipeline would supply is profits for investors at our 4 expense.</p>	PS2A2-126 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.
PS2A2-127	<p>5 Recent efforts for approval to build LNG shipping 6 terminals on the East Coast seemed to confirm that the 7 scheme is for much of the pipeline gas to be sold to foreign 8 customers, which wouldn't help our global warming problem 9 either.</p>	PS2A2-127 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.
PS2A2-128	<p>10 Is FERC's mandate to facilitate the supply of 11 affordable, cleaner, sustainable energy to Virginia and our 12 nation? If so, we should see an intentional shift away from 13 fossil fuels. Nothing is more important than water and air. 14 And you have heard over and over again our personal feelings 15 about environmental threats and other threats, our property 16 values, water pollution, farmland use disruption, explosions 17 threatening life and property, disruption of ecosystems, 18 serious erosion especially in our mountains, and the 19 unsightly scars across our beautiful mountains. The end.</p>	PS2A2-128 The Commission carries out its mandates under the NGA. It is the President and Congress who establish national energy policies. The EIS discusses impacts on water resources in section 4.3; air quality in section 4.11; farmlands in section 4.2; property values in section 4.9; and safety in section 4.11.
PS2A2-129	<p>20 MS. CRUTCHFIELD: My name is Carole Crutchfield. 21 I'm greatly concerned about the dangers of contamination and 22 disruption to the groundwater, rivers, streams and wetlands 23 posed by the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline project. 24 There is well-documented evidence that the 25 construction and maintenance of that pipeline carries with</p>	PS2A2-129 Groundwater, surface water, and wetlands are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-130

1 it dangerous toxic chemicals that will permeate the ground
2 around the pipeline, including anti-corrosive coatings
3 applied onto the pipe in situ, backfilling with coal ash
4 containing multiple dangerous toxic chemicals, leakage of
5 the pipeline contents which is liquefied natural gas
6 produced by fracking, maintenance of the pipeline
7 right-of-way, including the applications of herbicides and
8 defoliants.

PS2A2-131

9 The construction will also produce serious
10 erosion which may never be reversed. The runoff from the
11 right-of-way will dump large amounts of sediment into the
12 river streams and wetlands in the vicinity of the pipeline.
13 Bear in mind that this is a private for-profit enterprise
14 that is not designed to benefit any community through which
15 it passes. Every citizen whose property is directly or
16 indirectly impacted by this pipeline will face dangers to
17 the lives of their family, as well as to their property.

18 Attempts to clean up the eroded areas and remove
19 the toxic chemicals will create an extreme financial burden
20 on all of the tax payers. The only benefactors from this
21 project will be the investors at the expense of thousands of
22 citizens. Thank you.

PS2A2-132

23 MR. NESTER: I am Paul Nester, Vice President of
24 RGC Resources and Roanoke Gas Company. I support the
25 Mountain Valley Pipeline. I think it is a vital piece of

PS2A2-130

The pipeline coating would not release dangerous chemicals into the ground. Coal ash would not be used to backfill the trench. The pipeline would transport vaporized natural gas only; not LNG. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS2A2-131

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-132

Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

110

1 infrastructure to the long-term success of this region and
2 this community. I believe that it can provide the
3 much-needed energy infrastructure to help this area grow
4 economically in particular.

5 I believe the economic development can have
6 further lasting positive ramifications for the other
7 socio-economic positions of this area. I think the pipeline
8 is going to be properly regulated through the FERC. I
9 believe that the operators of the pipeline will operate it
10 in a safe, reliable manner for the benefit of the customers
11 and the communities that it will serve.

12 I think the pipeline also will have limited
13 environmental impacts. I trust that the FERC has done a
14 thorough and complete job in reviewing those impacts and
15 that the draft environmental impacts study reflects that.
16 No further comments.

17 MR. MCDEARMON: My name is Richard H. McDearmon,
18 Jr. And I wanted to talk about the draft environmental
19 impact statement and I just kind of summarized the -- I'm
20 using the executive summary here. And I was dismayed here
21 at the beginning that there's all these organizations that
22 have been involved in this document preparation, and there
23 are no Virginia agencies participating in this at all. And
24 I'm kind of shocked at that. Maybe it's my governor who
25 doesn't care. I'm shocked at that.

PS2A2-133

PS2A2-133

As stated in section 1.3 of the EIS, the FERC requested that the VADGIF and the VADEQ participate as cooperating agencies. However, these agencies declined.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 One thing about this whole project that really
2 just incites me is the word "interested stakeholders". I
3 get mail that says "Dear Stakeholder". I don't have any
4 stake in this. I'm a loser in this thing. These people
5 over here on the front page, the LLCs and the midstream DPTs
6 and the LCCs, they're the shareholders. I'm just gonna be a
7 loser if this thing happens. I'm real disappointed in the
8 term "stakeholder".

PS2A2-134

9 Also this thing talks about public involvement.
10 Well, so what? This is really a private involvement. I'm a
11 private landowner. I'm gonna be directly impacted by this
12 project if it happens. So I think there ought to be more
13 focus on the private involvement. Who cares about the
14 public involvement? I'm supposing it generates trickles out
15 on public, I kind of get that, but it's a private, it
16 impacts people privately. One couple, one individual at a
17 time.

PS2A2-134

The term “stakeholder” can be used to indicate the interested public, landowners, government representatives, and agencies. The FERC solicits feedback from anyone who wishes to comment on the projects. The terms “we,” “us,” or “our” used in the EIS refers to the FERC staff, third-party contractor, and cooperating agencies who participated in the production of the EIS.

PS2A2-135

18 A whole lot of this report, and in the summer,
19 they talk about "we" recommend, I'm assuming "we" being FERC
20 equals the environmental people, starts with a C and I can't
21 think of it right now. They are recommending all these
22 measures. Why not require? Who cares about a
23 recommendation? I can recommend a lot of stuff, but nobody
24 has to follow it. It's a recommendation.
25 Why don't we say "required" things? I'll bring

PS2A2-135

See the response to comment IND147-1 regarding recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

112

PS2A2-136

1 that up more. There's a whole lot of recommendations here.
2 Like, they talk about, well, "we'll have potential for soil
3 erosions". Yeah, I believe in that. Well, who's gonna
4 enforce soil erosion stuff, erosion and sediment control?
5 Who's gonna enforce that? Somebody from Virginia. I don't
6 see anybody from Virginia listed in here.

PS2A2-137

7 You talk about how you identified water supplies
8 and wells within 150 feet. Why not investigate a little
9 further out than that? I mean, my well could be 600 feet
10 and you blow the top of the mountain off, what's it gonna do
11 to my well underground? So I think this is a kind of a
12 limited study. It's a really narrow, little tight focus.

13 Maybe within 150 feet, you're not gonna find
14 much. But if you went a little broader to where people
15 actually have water supplies, I'm worried about how they're
16 gonna be affected. They're not gonna be dug up probably but
17 they -- who knows what happens underground? You're gonna
18 disturb it. A lot of disturbing. The wildlife as you're --

PS2A2-138

19 gonna have to run away. The forests are gonna be gone. My
20 land happens to be forest, so I won't have any forest up
21 there anymore. I'll have a clear-cut, I guess with grass on
22 it that somebody'll drive by and spray weed cleaner on and
23 keep it all mowed down. But I'm not happy with.

24 You worried about people whose houses are near
25 here and you talked about the affected landowners should

PS2A2-136

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PS2A2-137

See also the response to comment IND374-3 regarding water wells outside of 150 feet (500 feet in karst) of project areas.

PS2A2-138

See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife. See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

113

PS2A2-139 1 review these plans. I think all affected landowners should
2 be involved in this. You just shouldn't sit back. Over
3 here in the socio-economic part, there's no mention of any
4 kind of private property rights.

5 This is just real estate, this pipeline needs
6 acres and acres, you know, 6,800 acres of real estate to do
7 this project. But it's someone's property. It's not
8 acreage. And one thing that really gripes me here -- This
9 doesn't even address this -- Taking private property from
10 people via eminent domain for private profit. That really
11 irks me.

PS2A2-140 12 And I think FERC is collusion with the energy
13 companies. They've never denied a pipeline before. There's
14 a whole lot of money behind this. I think it's a collusion
15 thing. I don't think they're sensitive to much except
16 money. Oh, and it's not gonna have much of an impact.

PS2A2-141 17 There are gonna be adverse impacts on property values,
18 mortgages, insurance.

PS2A2-142 19 And they talk about multiple studies -- what
20 studies? That weren't done by the pipeline. Then it talks
21 about where people couldn't get mortgages because of the
22 pipelines. The studiers were unaware of that. I bet it's

PS2A2-143 23 out there somewhere. You identified all of these cultural
24 resources as not being eligible to be on a national historic
25 register. Does that mean it's okay to destroy them? I

PS2A2-139 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A2-140 See the response to comment IND196-5 regarding FERC approvals.

PS2A2-141 See the response to comment IND12-1 and IND12-2 regarding property values, insurance, and mortgages.

PS2A2-142 As stated in section 4.9.1.6 of the EIS, FERC staff conducted independent research regarding mortgages and insurance.

PS2A2-143 Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

114

PS2A2-144 1 would hope not.
2 This is gonna be built to the minimum DOT
3 standards. Minimum's just getting by. I think why couldn't
4 we have a higher standard of construction for safety and
5 we're gonna protect the public safety and welfare. Who's
6 gonna enforce this, the applicant's implementation of these
7 measures. Oh, it says that the applicants are gonna
8 implement their own management plan. Well, that's all well
9 and good, but who's gonna enforce it? And see that it was a
10 good plan?

PS2A2-145 11 Cumulative impacts. They -- "we" -- FERC sub
12 consultant concluded that the efforts of adding the impacts
13 of this MVP and EEP with the impacts of other projects would
14 not be significant. It's just a drop in the bucket. But
15 never mind, it's not in their yard. So what?

PS2A2-146 16 And the idea of studying alternates, using
17 existing pipeline. You're coming up here and saying, well,
18 existing systems have their capacity already subscribed.
19 How do we know that? Also, y'all sent me a letter that --
20 the pipeline folks sent me a letter saying, "Well, if you
21 sign this, we can build a 42" pipeline, then we'll have the
22 right to build a second pipeline right beside it. Why
23 couldn't we do that on one of these existing pipelines? And
24 then we say, "Oh, but they don't go from West Virginia to
25 Chatham, well, I mean you could tweak the ends of this on

PS2A2-144 As discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS, the Applicants would design, construct, operate, and maintain the proposed facilities in accordance with the DOT's Minimum Federal Safety Standards in 49 CFR 192. See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PS2A2-145 Cumulative impacts are addressed in section 4.13.

PS2A2-146 Section 3 of the EIS provided an analysis of looping existing systems.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

115

1 some existing pipeline. And just build the ends of it. Why
2 build a whole new route?

3 And we determined that the one pipe alternative
4 would not work. Well, I mean, why not build -- they claim
5 it wouldn't be technically feasible to build a mega
6 pipeline. Why not? Or build two at the same time,
7 somewhere else. Again, here's the stakeholder thing. I was
8 just real incensed with that. It's money versus the private
9 and unless I was getting a percentage of the gas footage
10 that came by, don't call me a stakeholder.

11 MS. WRAY: So you're not recording, I can tell
12 y'all I'm really nervous. This is not normally I do. I
13 work with little children. Are we ready now? My name is
14 Linda Wray. I'm one of the people who are being affected by
15 the pipeline. I live in Callaway, Virginia, and my husband
16 and I have a farm and that is his sole livelihood. It's a
17 family farm. I guess they've been farming for about three
18 generations.

19 And I'd like to think that I was gonna tell you
20 something that you haven't heard so far, but that's probably
21 not gonna be the case. It's coming right through the middle
22 of our farm. We have cattle. And we're just not sure how
23 that's gonna affect everything. We are concerned. Our
24 daughter lives in his parent's home. They're deceased now.
25 But she lives in the family home place which is within the

PS2A2-147

PS2A2-148

PS2A2-147

As stated in section 3 of the EIS, the one-pipe alternative is not feasible from a construction and engineering standpoint.

PS2A2-148

Section 3.5 of the final EIS has been updated with new information regarding this parcel.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-149 | 1 blast zone. And I think she'll be moving out if this
2 happens.
3 And we're not sure how it's gonna affect our
4 farming operation. As I said before, this is not a hobby
5 farm or just a recreational farm. This is our sole
6 livelihood. And we just thought that, after budgeting for
7 forty years that the land that's there would be part of our
PS2A2-150 | 8 retirement. So we realize that the value of it will
9 probably be affected as well.
10 And you know, that's kind of selfish, everything
PS2A2-151 | 11 I've said thus far. But I do worry about the impact on the
12 water and the environmental issues and we just would like to
13 preserve things, the beauty in the county and keep the water
14 safe for generations to come, even those who aren't affected
15 with the pipeline going through their land, you know, I know
16 that water is something that we cannot repair once those
17 things are damaged.
18 I think I mentioned most everything except we
19 would like to think that this is something that would
20 benefit us or benefit the county or the public, you know?
PS2A2-152 | 21 But I'm not sure the benefits for this county would actually
22 occur, I mean I've heard a few things that say that we may
23 actually bring in some business and that kind of thing. I
24 don't know about that. I think the benefits to our county
25 is to preserve the natural beauty, to try not to impact the

PS2A2-149 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-150 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-151 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A2-152 See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 117

1 environment.

PS2A2-153 2 And in my selfish manner, I would like to have
3 this land for my children and to be able to continue working
4 it and farming it as we've done over the years. I
5 appreciate you letting me come and speak. I think that's
6 all I have to say at this point, but I just, you know, hope
7 and pray that things will change. Thank you very much.

8 MS. CARTER: My name is Chris Carter. I am a
9 concerned citizen of Franklin County. I am against MVP for
10 several reasons. The main reason, this 42" pipeline is not
PS2A2-154 11 for domestic use. Roanoke Gas can provide natural gas via
12 Clear Brook to Franklin County if we have the demand. At
13 present, the demand is at 30%, not nearly the 60% they need.

PS2A2-155 14 The citizens of Franklin County will not benefit
15 in any way from the pipeline. Mountain Valley cannot be
16 trusted due to their underhanded business practices, their
PS2A2-156 17 lack of sharing information and their continual lies to the
18 citizens. Just a few areas of concern: the viewshed, the
19 watershed, property values, imminent domain and safety.

PS2A2-157 20 Franklin County has grown over the years due to,
21 in part, retirees coming to the area. They come to enjoy
22 the viewshed, our mountains, lakes and rivers. Younger
23 people are also enjoying the rivers, lakes and hiking
24 trails. Over 60% of the residents of Franklin County will
25 have their viewshed negatively impacted with the MVP

PS2A2-153 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming.

PS2A2-154 As stated in section 1.2.1 of the EIS, the MVP pipeline would transport natural gas from areas of production in the Appalachian Basin industrial users and power generators in the Mid-Atlantic and Southeastern United States, as well as to LDCs in Virginia. The pipeline is for domestic use.

PS2A2-155 See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County.

PS2A2-156 Construction and operation of the projects would be monitored by regulatory agencies.

PS2A2-157 Visual impacts are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-157
cont'd

1 permanent pathway.

PS2A2-158

2 The Franklin County motto is "The land between
3 the lakes", but this will be destroyed with all the
4 sedimentation and contamination due to the 140-plus waterway
5 crossings. Recreational water activities will also be
6 affected at the lake, as well as the rivers. Private wells
7 and streams will be destroyed or contaminated due to the
8 disruption of the watershed.

PS2A2-159

9 Property values will decrease. Who would
10 purchase a home or farm with a pipeline going through it?
11 Residents have had appraisals done. If the pipeline is
12 built, their property value will decrease by at least 30%
13 according to the appraisers. A for-profit corporation
14 taking citizen land is not right.

PS2A2-160

15 Safety is another major concern. With over
16 300-plus property owners and many more residents who are in
17 the blast zone or evacuation zone, I will not live in a home
18 that can be incinerated, and my family killed at any time.
19 Our county does not have the equipment, manpower nor
20 training to handle an incident. Available water supply to
21 fight a fire, along with our county road system will hamper
22 any type of rescue. Just getting to turn off valves could
23 be problematic. Neither our county nor surrounding counties
24 have the equipment, manpower, training to fight a fire gas
25 leak, or the devastation which would occur with a leak or

PS2A2-158

Impacts on water resources are discussed in section 4.3; recreation in 4.8. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS and in comment FA11-15. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS2A2-159

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS2A2-160

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response. See the response to comment IND334-3 regarding valve shut-off time.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-160
cont'd

1 explosion.

2 Do not grant a permit to the proposed Mountain

PS2A2-161

3 Valley Pipeline. Their surveyors are sketchy at best. They

4 operated in Franklin County without concern for people or

5 property. They have not done their due diligence. Thank

6 you.

7 MS. ARTHUR: My name is Sandy Arthur. I live at

8 440 Little Mountain Circle, Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151.

PS2A2-162

9 I'm here to discuss -- our property borders Teels Creek and

10 I brought photos from the rain in the first week of October,

11 that I've marked on illustrating the debris line of this

12 creek in a rugged mountainous area where during heavy rains

13 the creek'll rise ten feet.

14 And right now, the only thing that's holding the

15 bank are the trees and the rocks. The subsoil is sand. So

16 in areas where there's not trees, it's eroding quickly. I

17 just do not see how you can bring through a 42" pipeline and

18 blast and expect to put down any sort of sediment control

19 and come back a year or two later and pull it up and expect

20 to hold those banks, or even the safety of the pipeline and

21 protect the integrity of the pipeline when you're going

22 through areas like you are in Franklin County.

23 It's too steep, it's too rugged, I have on my

24 property rock outcroppings all around, from big to small,

25 but that's, other than the roots of the trees, the only

PS2A2-161

The Commission would make its decision about the projects based on the consolidated record.

PS2A2-162

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion and erosion control devices. The final EIS has been revised to discuss flash flooding.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-162 | 1 thing that's there holding the creek bed back.
cont'd | 2 I brought several photos just to go in with my
3 statement on that. My husband and I are both veterans. We
4 worked very hard for this property. We planned on raising

PS2A2-163 | 5 as our forever home. We plan on raising our family there.
6 And so, beyond the fact of private property rights, and
7 whether the pipeline is warranted or even needed
8 economically, I feel that a Fortune 500 Company, just like
9 everybody else, should have to go through property that
10 people are willing to sell, just like I would have to if I
11 wanted to put in a store somewhere. I can't just take
12 somebody's land and say, "This is what I wanna do."

PS2A2-164 | 13 I have not yet been surveyed. I don't
14 necessarily believe as much of the route has been surveyed
15 as stated by Mountain Valley. And I would just want it to

PS2A2-165 | 16 be known that the creek is very strong and very powerful and
17 other than the rocks and the trees there, if you remove
18 that, I just do not see how you're gonna prevent sediment
19 from entering our waterway. Teels Creek, which we're on,
20 feeds right into Little Creek, which feeds right into Smith
21 Mountain Lake, which is the community's water.

PS2A2-166 | 22 I also don't see, if you're blasting rock 100
23 feet from my house, how that's not going to affect my well,
24 because the blasting will be a couple hundred feet, you
25 know, be 100 feet lower than my well actually sits, and you

PS2A2-163 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS2A2-164 See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding survey of the route.

PS2A2-165 See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion and erosion control devices.

PS2A2-166 See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

121

PS2A2-166
cont'd

1 can't tell me blasting all that rock and everything else
2 isn't gonna affect the water table underneath there as
3 you're trying to come through mountains, essentially.
4 And I guess in the South they like to say
5 hollers. Anyway -- I've spoken and submitted comments a
6 bunch of times, and I just wanted to come and bring some
7 photos illustrating that. I have a photo also of a 25-foot
8 tree here, that with the rains in the first week of October,
9 was went around a hairpin like a 110 degree turn, and the
10 only thing that stopped it was it got caught in a vine.

PS2A2-167

11 That's how powerful these creeks are, and how
12 fast they flood and how strong they are, and I just don't
13 think you can put a pipeline through there. They're
14 paralleling this creek and crossing this creek a bunch of
15 times. How that you can put a pipeline through there and
16 trust that it's not gonna wash away once you get rid of the
17 roots and the rocks. Or trust that it's gonna maintain its
18 integrity under forces like that. That's my statement.

PS2A2-168

19 MR. AKERS: Eric Akers. All right. I really
20 don't understand the purpose that the pipeline serves as far
21 as Franklin County goes, because it has no value to the
22 county whatsoever, other than it's destroying our property
23 and possibly putting hazard waste into the water.
24 It's right down from my house, which is a creek
25 that I, as a kid, have fished in all my life. And I have

PS2A2-167

A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in section 4.3.2 of the EIS.

PS2A2-168

See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County. Impacts on water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 land that my dad has passed down to me. And I had planned
2 that my boys also, as I built to the top of the land that,
3 as I either passed away or was fortunate enough to see them
4 married and have kids of their own, that I could pass the
5 land down, that they could build right down from me, up
6 above the creek, and their kids could fish in the creek as
7 well.

PS2A2-169

8 However, with the threat of the pipeline coming
9 in, I myself do not want my wife, children, family, near the
10 pipeline as it is, nor do I want my kids building where I
11 had planned for them to build. I would like to know, as far

PS2A2-170

12 as Franklin County goes, what is the benefit? Where is the
13 benefit of this pipeline coming through at? And don't tell
14 me just jobs to put the pipeline in, because once that's
15 come and gone, there is no jobs. So I'm at a total loss as
16 to why anybody in the county would want the pipeline through
17 Franklin County to begin with.

PS2A2-171

18 And I cannot believe that more people aren't up
19 here standing against this. I don't think they've put out
20 enough information for the county to understand what is
21 going on, what is happening. The benefits of just a few

PS2A2-172

22 people for the gas that they'll be getting and making money
23 on as opposed to what it's doing to our property values and
24 so on and so forth. That is my main -- and I cannot believe
25 that I would not want my kids to have the land that my dad

PS2A2-169

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-170

See the response to comment PS2A1-47 regarding tax revenue for Franklin County. See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PS2A2-171

Section 1.4 of the EIS provides an overview of public involvement. The Commission would make a determination of public benefits.

PS2A2-172

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

	20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016	123
	1 has passed to me and I looked to pass to my children.	
	2 MR. FRITH: My name is Glen Frith, 580 Wildwood	
	3 Road, Boones Mill, Virginia. This pipeline crosses my land.	
PS2A2-173	4 I can't believe we're giving up our property rights. I had	PS2A2-173 Mountain Valley does not propose to export natural gas.
	5 served in the Armed Services and certainly don't think we	
	6 should be giving up our property rights for company that	
	7 does no benefit to anyone around us, and my certain belief	
	8 is all this gas is going overseas for someone else's	PS2A2-174 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. See
	9 pocketbook and not ours.	the response to IND2-1 regarding safety. Section 3.5 of the final
PS2A2-174	10 I've got a 150-acre farm that I can no longer	EIS has been updated with new information regarding this parcel.
	11 pass onto my kids because this pipeline will basically	See the response to comment PS1B1-15 regarding the potential
	12 divide it up that my house now is in a blast zone. You	impact radius.
	13 know, what is made by humans will always be a problem. We	
PS2A2-175	14 hope it's not there, but it will happen somewhere. And it's	PS2A2-175 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic
	15 happening all over the place. And when they start fracking	fracturing.
	16 land in West Virginia, they are gonna cause problems, and	
	17 it's already showing up in earthquakes and all.	
PS2A2-176	18 My land is within a half a mile of the earthquake	PS2A2-176 Earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.
	19 fault that's already been, you know, designated and	
	20 everything by Virginia Tech has studied there. It's got	
	21 earthquakes faults. So that's the big problem. I've got a	
PS2A2-177	22 cattle farm that -- if it comes through and there's any kind	PS2A2-177 See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.
	23 of leakage with the methane gas -- and everything else.	
PS2A2-178	24 Erosion problems is another problem. It's just so many	PS2A2-178 See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.
	25 things wrong with this that --	

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-179

1 My son, when he got married five years ago, he
2 had picked out a house site, and their survey stakes missed
3 it ten feet, and it was up on a ridge. And now, 'course
4 he's not gonna build there, if this does come. So it's just
5 got so many, many issues with this. At first, you know, I
6 thought, when I first heard about it the first week, and
7 then I really dug into it, I thought it might be something
8 to it.

9 I'm a building contractor by trade and I know
10 what the erosion problems can do any small job site, and
11 every time I disturb just a little bit of land on my farm to
12 refence or to do some stuff, then if it doesn't grow grass
13 right away, I've sowed one little small piece of land three
14 times because you never know when these hard rainstorms are
15 gonna come --

16 And it's hard to maintain a small piece of land.
17 I'm talking about a quarter acre, half acre, I try to do it
18 each time as I clear land. And when you're talking about
19 running a pipeline, like I say, I'm a contractor and I know
20 what it takes. And all they care about is coming through
21 and later I've got to deal with all these problems.

PS2A2-180

22 And they even want to use my driveway, which is a
23 paved driveway, for some road access. I mean, I can't
24 imagine what that's gonna be. I just spent close to
25 \$100,000 in the last twenty years building a paved road, and

PS2A2-179

The commentor's statements regarding their building site are noted.

PS2A2-180

Access roads are discussed in section 2.3.5 and appendix E. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

125

PS2A2-180
cont'd

1 they wanna use that. I mean I do not understand this. So I
2 would, you know, highly recommend to anyone to really think
3 what's going on. And put it in a safer area, you know. If
4 you're gonna put something, put it smaller, and there should
5 be only one in the State of Virginia. They've got two to
6 three proposals. Why do they do that? So you've got so
7 many things here. I don't know of a good thing. If this
8 was a water line, feeding, sending water somewhere. It's
9 not dangerous, that would be another story. It's
10 underground.

PS2A2-181

11 But they're coming through the side of the
12 mountain that's got nothing but rock. And they gonna do
13 blasting or chipping away, and it's, it's just, whoever's
14 making these decisions, please think about something besides
15 money. I mean it needs to be something besides money. And

PS2A2-182

16 safety would be the number one thing. So, you know, I'm
17 giving up -- and the property values are gonna be going down

PS2A2-183

18 the tubes.
19 And I sit on the Equalization Board here in the
20 county and I can tell you, we've already talked about this.
21 The property values will drop because who wants to buy land
22 within a pipeline within a blast zone? Who would wanna do
23 that? I've got a farm that's gonna drop in value right
24 much. And it's just, just ridiculous. It really, really
25 is. So thank you very much for having me here.

PS2A2-181

Section 4.2 of the EIS discusses shallow bedrock. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS2A2-182

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-183

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 MS. FADER: My name's Pat Fader. I live in
2 Ferrum, Virginia. And friends of mine that are concerned
3 citizens are on the pipeline that is about to continue its
4 plans and agendas in the Franklin County area. I'd like to
5 speak to the courts and help them to understand that this is
6 a free people. They are God-fearing people. They're one of
7 the last in our country.

8 And I know that the agendas of Washington through
9 the Heritage Action where I participate in the Sentinel
10 Program and the -- Cleon Skausen, which has turned the
11 hearts of many people to understand the politics of what's
12 going on right now, and the agendas in the world, and the
13 global agendas. I'm quite familiar with all of them.

14 I travel the whole country. I'm up and down the
15 East Coast because that's my sanity. I visit with people of
16 all peoples, all kinds of people. I hang around with the
17 rich and the poor. And this is a dirty trick. The property
18 rights of these people belong to these people. It's
19 belonged to these people for 150 years or more, and I think
20 that this pipeline is nothing more than a fraud in order to
21 destroy the property rights and to bring in the agenda of
22 the socialists, the globalists and all those that are
23 seeking to overturn the Constitution that I have learned so
24 deeply and loved so fearfully.

25 I study with Hillsdale College. They have taught

PS2A2-184

PS2A2-184

Property rights are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-185

1 me the actual foundation of our country, and I'm watching
2 the agendas come in, one at a time, like an Army against
3 these people. They're old, their families are still loving
4 and kind and good. And the quiet is still here. I believe
5 this pipeline is going to take that from them, as it's
6 taking every part of this nation one piece at a time.
7 I pray to God and man that you can turn it around
8 before it stops the heart of freedom in this world. Because
9 there is no place else in this world where freedom will live
10 again if you allow this agenda to continue to take the
11 property rights and the families apart piece by piece. And
12 I hope that you'll forgive me for speaking my mind. I turn
13 back the rest of the time.

PS2A2-186

14 MS. MANNIS: We are Leroy and Matilda Manns.
15 We're here to voice our opinion in opposition of this
16 pipeline. First of all, we don't understand why we have to
17 have the pipeline. All of these years we've gotten along
18 fine without it. And I don't understand why our county and
19 elected officials are selling us out like this.
20 We and so many people have voiced their concern
21 against it. And we look at the economy of Franklin County,
22 how it has grown. We've got so much going for us in these
23 last few years, thinking back. You've got the Harvester
24 Center, you've got Smith Mountain Lake bringing in a lot of
25 money. And also you have -- not only that, but the film

PS2A2-185

See the response to comment PS2A2-184.

PS2A2-186

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 industry that has come to this Smith Mountain Lake area for
2 the movies and everything that has been done.

PS2A2-187

3 And it seems that the officials are not listening
4 to what we have to say, and it's our property that is going
5 down in value. We are in the blast zone. And you know,
6 it's like we've been sold out. And I just don't understand
7 it. But you know, I think the officials need to look at
8 what they're doing because once -- you've got so many people
9 who are against this pipeline.

10 You know, they may be in office now and they can
11 do damage, but sometimes I think they don't realize that
12 another election is coming up and you know, are they gonna
13 be in office again? If you do us in, then don't expect us
14 to re-elect you. It doesn't work that way. And like I say,
15 totally against it.

PS2A2-188

16 MR. MANN: And why is it coming through the low
17 man's properties? I mean, you know, I don't see it going
18 through some of these properties that are way up there in
19 value with the big houses and everything. They seem to be
20 just taking place in the medium income bracket people. And
21 so there's a lot of fault to what's going on. Are we being
22 railroaded? And for what purpose?

23 And so we're gonna keep our eye on what's going
24 on. And this is not gonna be the last of it.

25 MS. MANN: This is just another example of more

PS2A2-187

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-188

Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. The pipeline was routed to go from areas of production in Wetzel County, West Virginia to a delivery point at Transco Station 165 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia. It would be situated on ridgetops as much as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 American greed. That's it.

PS2A2-189

2 MR. MANN: If the people have gotten along this
3 long without that pipeline, there's no need for it now. And
4 that's what we wanted to say.

PS2A2-189

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS2A2-190

5 MR. BOOTHE: My name is C.J. Boothe. I in here
6 to support the pipeline. I'm from this area. This area is
7 probably not the most job-friendly right now. The pipeline
8 would bring, I think, more industry to this area. It's much
9 farmland right now.

PS2A2-190

Comment noted.

10 I know that FERC is gonna do their due diligence
11 with the pipeline, so I'm here in support of the pipeline
12 and the overall economics for the pipeline, I think would be
13 beneficial to the whole region. There's no natural gas in
14 Franklin County. There's been jobs and corporations turned
15 down for the reason of no natural gas. So I'm here for the
16 benefit of the pipeline. And that's it, sir.

PS2A2-191

17 MS. AMERSON: My name is Marilyn Amerson. I live
18 in the Dillons Mill Road area of the county, close to Bent
19 Mountain. I am very concerned about the pipeline for three
20 main reasons.

21 Number one, the area where I live -- there's no
22 road out. We live on a dead-end road. If there were to be
23 an explosion, an accident, anything of that nature, we would
24 have no way to get out of the area. We don't even have cell
25 phone service where we live. And so we couldn't even call

PS2A2-191

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Mountain Valley would maintain access for landowners. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

130

1 someone for help. So that's our main concern.

PS2A2-192

2 The second concern is, having lived where they
3 built a road through our area when I was a kid, I also know
4 the area is very rocky. It's just full of rock. The phone
5 line for our home, they can't even put it underground
6 because there's so much rock in the hill, so I also know
7 that going through these mountains and through the rocks is
8 gonna be, it's gonna cause a lot of blasting, it's gonna
9 affect the groundwater, and it's going to affect the
10 farmlands and just the lands that have been there since I
11 was a kid.

12 I live on land that belonged to my grandfather.
13 And he lost it in the Great Depression and my father bought
14 it back with money he made flying in World War II. And this
15 is land we wanted to hand down to our kids and we don't
16 wanna see it destroyed. And we love it.

PS2A2-193

17 And my third point is that I don't believe that
18 this is an environmental issue so much as it is an economic
19 issue. And I believe that if this were an environmental
20 issue that this pipeline would've one through the first
21 route that they chose through Floyd County, but I think that
22 the citizens of Floyd, good people of Floyd, they got
23 together, they believed in their land, they got their money
24 and so it didn't go through there.

25 The area that you're putting it through, I think

PS2A2-192

The EIS discusses shallow bedrock in section 4.2. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. Groundwater is addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS2A2-193

The EIS discusses route selection in section 3. Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia. Socioeconomic issues are discussed in section 4.9.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2A2-193
cont'd

1 that they're using people that they can just run over that
2 don't have money that really can't stand up to this thing.
3 And there's no profit for the people in this area. If they
4 were providing jobs or something like that, that might be
5 different. My father allowed them to build a road through
6 his land. He allowed them to put electricity through his
7 land. But he was also a business owner and he would have
8 never accepted any help from the federal government and he
9 would have been opposed to anyone who accepted it for
10 personal gain.

PS2A2-194

11 I probably am not even taking my three minutes,
12 but my opposite to this is that number one, safety issues
13 for the people who will be affected have not even been
14 addressed. This isn't going through my land, but it's going

PS2A2-195

15 within sight. I can see where this pipeline is gonna go.
16 No one has come to talk to us. No one has called a
17 community meeting.

PS2A2-196

18 But the people that are selling their easements,
19 somehow or other, they've been contacted. They talked to
20 those people. And it's just that -- again, it's not
21 economic. But I do believe that this is detrimental to the
22 area. I believe it's detrimental to the soil and the water.
23 And I can't believe that they want to put a 42" pipe through
24 mountains filled with rock. And we are obviously opposed to
25 it. And that's all.

PS2A2-194

Safety is addressed in section 4.12 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS2A2-195

Public involvement is discussed in section 1.4 of the EIS. FERC regulations require the applicant to contact landowners that would be directly impacted and those directly adjacent to the proposed project.

PS2A2-196

The EIS addresses soil in section 4.2 and water resources in section 4.3.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2A – Franklin County High School, Rocky Mount, VA– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

132

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Rocky Mount, Virginia

16 Date: November 2, 2016

17 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
18 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
19 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
20 of the proceedings.

21

22

23

24 David Voigtsberger

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B - ROOM 1

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 Office of Energy Projects
4 - - - - - x
5 Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC Docket No. CP16-10-000
6 Equitrans, LP Docket No. CP16-13-000
7 - - - - - x
8 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PROJECT
9 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT
10 Nicholas County High School
11 30 Grizzly Road
12 Summersville, West Virginia 26651
13 Wednesday, November 2, 2016
14 A public verbal comment session on the Draft EIS was
15 held, puruant to notice. starting at 5 p.m.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (5:00 p.m.)

3 MS. RAPP: B (as in Boy) -e-n-j-e-a-n (one word)
4 I's Benjean -- last name is Rapp, R-a-p-p. According to an
5 economic benefit report the development of the Mountain
6 Pipeline will be considered a project that could result in
7 probably 500 million dollars and it would be money that
8 would be coming to not only the state of West Virginia but
9 the monies would follow through like a severance tax to the
10 counties that it goes toward.

PS2B1-1

11 And so I am here to say I am in favor if it okay.
12 The reason I am in favor of it is West Virginia needs jobs.
13 We need jobs that will pay a good wage and not only that in
14 the long-term as we look at the gas that can be brought
15 through those pipelines -- it can be developed out of West
16 Virginia because we know what the Marcellus shale is and we
17 know it is even into Nicholas County into the Richwood area.
18 So being a landowner here I am for anything that
19 can happen that will help the economic development in
20 Nicholas County in the state of West Virginia so I am in
21 favor.

PS2B1-1

Comment noted.

PS2B1-2

22 MS. WAYNE: Linda Wayne. The main reason I am
23 here I was just wondering what area of the county you are
24 going to be going through and I saw that you are going right
25 behind 300 acres that I own down Huston Run and Lowell Fork

PS2B1-2

Maps of the proposed pipeline alignment can be found in appendix B of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-3 | 1 -- that's in the Erbacon -- down over by Erbacon.
2 | And I just came to find out you know, like how
3 | wide of an area you are going to be using and how much you
4 | are paying for the pipeline or whatever that goes through
5 | people. And then some of my questions were answered out
6 | there -- they said there is not going to be wells drilled or
7 | fracking or that kind of thing with these gas lines. They
8 | are just mainly going underneath to transport the gas from
9 | up north in Virginia to the south.

10 | I have seen that there are going to be stations
11 | or something though -- and I think one of them is supposed
12 | to be in the area where my land is, some kind of a station
13 | or whatever you all call it.

14 | MS. MARDINEY: Compressor station.

PS2B1-4 | 15 | MS. WAYNE: Okay that's what I was wondering what
16 | that entails. Is there odors with it or you know like air
17 | quality -- I don't think you are going to get close to the
18 | creek but someone said that in that area you may be going
19 | under the road and so you will be going right along where
20 | the creek is. And I just wondered because I own land on
21 | both sides of the road -- I own land on both sides of the
22 | creek and so those were my concerns.

PS2B1-5 | 23 | MR. HARVEY: Timmy Harvey. I was just wanting to
24 | say that I am for this thing. I am from the Operating
25 | Engineers Local 132 in Charleston and I think it will create

PS2B1-3 The MVP would generally use a 125-foot-wide right-of-way as described in section 2 of the EIS. Easement negotiations are between the applicants and the landowner. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS2B1-4 Air quality is discussed in section 4.11.1 of the EIS.

PS2B1-5 Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

4

1 a lot of jobs -- good-paying jobs and I just want you to
2 know that I am for it and that's the reason I am here,
3 that's basically it.

4 MS. BRYSON: Autumn Bryson -- A-u-t-u-m-n
5 B-r-y-s-o-n and should I say my affiliation if I am
6 representing -- I'm representing West Virginia Rivers
7 Coalition. So I am an environmental scientist employed with
8 West Virginia Rivers Coalition and I have reviewed the Draft
9 Environmental Impact Statement and I feel that there is
10 information that is lacking and that was not adequately
11 addressed within the DEIS.

12 So I am just going to go through all of those
13 issues. For the river crossings the DEIS states that MVP
14 plans to cross the Elk, the gully and the Greenbrier Ridge
15 Rivers using the open cut wet crossing method. Open cut wet
16 crossing uses no water diversion and we feel that it is very
17 invasive and an impactful crossing method.

18 And in the Water Resources Report MVP stated that
19 they were going to do the HTD and the EIS stated that the
20 HTD method wasn't able to be used because of the train. And
21 so they went to the wet crossing but we want the required --
22 we want there to be additional analysis of the crossing
23 methods to determine which method would be the least
24 impactful of those crossing methods.

25 Other pipelines are using coffer dam methods and

PS2B1-6

PS2B1-6

Mountain Valley now intends to cross the Elk, Gauley, and Greenbrier Rivers using coffer dams and dry techniques. Since Mountain Valley would cross all waterbodies using dry techniques, there would be a low potential for downstream sedimentation and turbidity. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the final EIS. The feasibility of crossing waterbodies using a trenchless crossing method was discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-6
cont'd

1 so we would like to see additional analysis of those
2 crossing methods to determine which has the minimal
3 environmental impact on those rivers.

PS2B1-7

4 For the wetland crossings the DEIS claims that
5 there is no net loss of wetlands but then it states that MVP
6 has not supplied the information regarding their proposal to
7 permanently fill 44 wetlands along the access roads. And we
8 feel that the permanent filling of 44 wetlands is a
9 significant impact and needs to be addressed within the EIS
10 and if MVP has not supplied FERC with this information then
11 they need to issue a Supplemental EIS or it is needs to be
12 addressed within the Final EIS along with the wetland
13 crossings.

14 If they are proposing to fill additional -- if
15 they are proposing to permanently fill 44 wetlands we would
16 like to see a mitigation plan associated with that.

PS2B1-8

17 For the drinking water resources the water wells
18 within the impact zone were not identified and you cannot
19 adequately assess the impacts on drinking water resources
20 without identifying private and domestic drinking water
21 wells within the route so we would like to see all of the
22 drinking water wells identified and have that information in
23 a Supplemental EIS or in the Final EIS -- I'm not even like
24 close --

25 MS. MARDINEY: That's alright keep going.

PS2B1-7

See the response to comment IND209-1 regarding the permanent fill of wetlands.

PS2B1-8

See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending information about water wells.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-9 1 MS. BRYSON: The DEIS doesn't adequately assess
2 the impacts of construction on aquatic life. MVP has not
3 submitted the results of their analysis on sediment and
4 turbidity from wet crossing methods and FERC needs this
5 information to draw conclusions regarding the effects of the
6 turbidity and sedimentation on the fisheries and aquatic
7 life.

PS2B1-10 8 We would like to see within either the
9 Supplemental or a Final EIS an impact assessment on trout
10 fisheries specifically native brook trout and wild brown
11 trout. These fish are very important to our economy as far
12 as you know fly fishing goes and we want to make sure that
13 there are adequate protections around these aquatic species
14 and if there are trout streams within the impact zone then
15 we would want to see additional measures taken to insure
16 that there is no sedimentation into those rivers that could
17 kill the trout.

PS2B1-11 18 The DEIS identifies 94 karst features and FERC
19 requested route variations to avoid these features and the
20 results of the study to determine the interconnection
21 between karst and the water resources has not been
22 completed. We feel that this information is very necessary
23 to assess the environmental impacts and we would like to see
24 this information in a Supplemental or a Final EIS.

PS2B1-12 25 We don't think that you can adequately assess the

PS2B1-9 A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS. Impacts on aquatic resources are addressed in section 4.6.

PS2B1-10 As stated in section 4.6.1 of the EIS, the MVP would cross waterbodies containing populations of wild brown and brook trout, stocked rainbow trout, and freshwater mussels. The VADGIF restricts construction within waterbodies that contain wild trout from October 1 through March 31 and in waterbodies that contain stocked trout from March 15 through May 15. As stated in section 4.6.2 of the EIS, Mountain Valley would adhere to all federal and state permit conditions regarding the minimization of impacts on fisheries of special concern including adhering to recommended work windows for in-water construction (or requesting a work-window modification, if needed). Mountain Valley would also attempt to minimize impacts on fisheries by relocating fishes from the construction areas following guidance from the VADGIF, who requested that fish be relocated during waterbody crossings in Virginia. Finally, aside from a temporary disruption of fishing in the vicinity of the waterbody crossings during construction, we do not expect the project to impact recreational fisheries in West Virginia or Virginia.

PS2B1-11 Section 4.1 of the EIS has been revised to provide additional details regarding karst features in the project area. Section 4.3 of the EIS provides a discussion of impacts and mitigation on water resources. Mountain Valley has adopted the Mount Tabor Variation into its proposed route to lessen impacts on the Mount Tabor Sinkhole Plain.

PS2B1-12 The supplemental filings by Mountain Valley on October 14 and 20, 2016 mostly concerned minor route variations to address landowner concerns and alternatives recommended in the draft EIS. These route changes have been analyzed in the final EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-12
cont'd
1 impacts until a final route has been determined and so we
2 want within the Final EIS we hope that they route -- the
3 final route would be determined and all of the impacts along
4 that route assessed.

PS2B1-13
5 The DEIS states that 78% of the pipeline route is
6 susceptible to landslides but MVP has not supplied the
7 detailed landslide mitigation plan and FERC had also
8 requested route adjustments and additional information on
9 the landslide prone areas and the BMPs to mitigate hazards
10 from potential impacts and this information is very critical
11 -- we feel, in evaluating the impacts from pipeline
12 construction. And we want to make sure that it is included
13 in a Supplemental or a Final EIS.

PS2B1-14
14 The crossing of underground coal mine issue will
15 be similar to crossing karst terrain and the DEIS does not
16 address the impacts of subsidence on the pipeline integrity
17 and how the pipeline company plans to avoid subsidence when
18 crossing underground mine lands.

PS2B1-15
19 The scour analysis is very important for all of
20 the stream crossings and we want to make sure that is
21 included in the Final EIS. There's an endemic crayfish the

PS2B1-16
22 Cambarus Pauleyi -- it's a crayfish that is only found in
23 high elevation wetlands in the Meadow and the Greenbrier
24 River water sheds and I don't know if it is federally listed
25 but I think it might be proposed to be listed due to the

PS2B1-13 See the response to IND177-1 regarding landslides and Mountain Valley's revised *Landslide Mitigation Plan*.

PS2B1-14 Underground mines are discussed in section 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of the EIS.

PS2B1-15 Section 4.3 of the EIS has been revised to include updated scour analysis information provided by Mountain Valley in October 2016 and February 2017 and analyzed by FERC staff.

PS2B1-16 Section 4.7 has been updated as appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-16
cont'd

1 narrow geographic range and there has been significant
2 reductions in the habitat because of the conversion of
3 pasture -- from wetlands to pasture.
4 So the pipeline going through this habitat would
5 further reduce the habitat and that needs to be addressed
6 within the EIS. The DEIS states that there are no Tier 3
PS2B1-17
7 crossings and upon our analysis there are two or three
8 crossings so we want to make sure that there are two or
9 three crossings. So we want to make sure that that issue is
10 addressed.

PS2B1-18
11 The flooding in the Greenbrier and Meadow River
12 -- we don't feel that that issue was adequately addressed.
13 We had a thousand year flood in June of this year and the
14 Greenbrier and Meadow Rivers -- the scouring was crazy --
15 not just the main rivers but the tributaries. And that is a
16 major concern that the scouring in those smaller tributaries
17 will impact the integrity of the pipeline so that issue
18 needs to be addressed.

PS2B1-19
19 For the temporary and permanent alternate water
20 supplies if there is a disruption in someone's private
21 drinking water public drinking water source we would like to
22 see a contingency plan in the EIS to address this issue and
23 specifically how the pipeline company would plan to provide
24 a permanent alternative water supply because that seems like
25 impossible.

PS2B1-17 Section 4.3 has been updated as appropriate.

PS2B1-18 A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in section 4.3.2 of the EIS.

PS2B1-19 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

9

PS2B1-20

1 For the dust control the water sources haven't
2 been identified in the EIS and the dust control is going to
3 be needed during the driest months and also when the stream
4 flow is the lowest. So if you are drawing 55,000 gallons of
5 water a day for dust control we want to know where that
6 water is going to be coming from and whether our rivers and
7 streams can even sustain somebody withdrawing that 55,000
8 gallons per day because in those low flow months there is
9 not enough water to sustain that. So we want to know exactly
10 where they are proposing to pull this water from.

PS2B1-21

11 And the out of basin hydro-static testing
12 discharge was not adequately addressed. There are areas
13 where they say they are going to pull the water from one
14 watershed and then release it in another and that needs to
15 be -- the impact of that withdrawal from one watershed and
16 putting it into another water basin needs to be addressed.
17 So in conclusion we feel that the DEIS is lacking
18 sufficient and very critical information to fully assess all
19 of the environmental impacts of this project. We need to
20 have the final route and all of the additional information
21 that I listed to assess the impacts. So I think that a
22 Supplemental EIS would need to be issued or all of this
23 issue would need to be contained in the final EIS.

PS2B1-22

24 And I just want to state for the record that I do
25 not feel that these meetings meet the requirement of public

PS2B1-20

As stated in section 4.3 of the EIS, Mountain Valley would obtain water from municipal, surface water, or groundwater sources for dust-control purposes. The amount of water that would be used for dust-control is highly dependent on the conditions at the time of work (e.g., weather, soil type, vegetation cover). If groundwater is used to suppress dust, Mountain Valley would adhere to the measures outlined in its *Water Resources Identification and Testing Plan* to minimize, avoid, and mitigate (if applicable) any impacts on groundwater resources. Additionally, Mountain Valley would work with the FS and appropriate agencies to develop a stream monitoring plan to be implemented during operation of the MVP. Mountain Valley would adhere to its *Erosion and Sediment Control Plans* and *Fugitive Dust Control Plan* to minimize impacts associated with the use water to suppress dust.

PS2B1-21

Section 4.3 has been revised to address inter-basin transfer.

PS2B1-22

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-22
cont'd

1 because they are private and I feel like that is a slap in
2 the face to the NEPA process and that's all.

3 MS. VALDEZ: My name is Ranell Valdez.
4 R-a-n-e-l-l and my husband William is not here, he is not
5 present tonight. Valdez -- but I am representing both of
6 us. Okay I would like to start by saying that my husband's
7 name William Valdez appears on the distribution list but we
8 did not receive a report. I did pick up a CD tonight and
9 have requested a hard copy.

10 However, we have had numerous times MVP
11 negotiators and various people wanting to survey our
12 property and offering us a settlement, wanting to do so as
13 soon as possible for the approximate 6 acres of land that
14 they would like to purchase from us along with the staging
15 area that they would like to use.

16 So there are several concerns, not only as a
17 property owner that I would like to voice but also just as a
18 community member. And to be honest I have not trusted
19 anything that MVP has sold to the public as facts that they
20 are presenting. MVP has misled people with information

PS2B1-23

21 presented initially by the FTI consulting group that
22 involved too many conflicts of interest on their part and
23 too much missing data along with misleading data concerning
24 the financial benefit of this project in the Greenbrier
25 Valley and West Virginia area.

PS2B1-23 The commentor was included on the CD mailing list.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 And I pray that FERC will look at all of the data
2 or lack thereof and make a decision based on the health of
3 the citizens of the state of West Virginia and Virginia, not
4 the funding it stands to lose. This is not just a decision
5 on potential profit. This should be a decision based on
6 environmental impacts and safety.

PS2B1-24

7 The pipeline is not necessary. According to our
8 recent independent study that shows the pipeline
9 infrastructure in place that is there in place to fulfill
10 the current and future needs of the U.S. markets. Our
11 nation has agreed to cut the use of fossil fuels not
12 increase the production or sale of such.

PS2B1-24

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing and export.

13 And if our country is in such a great energy
14 crisis why is the fracking industry as a whole fighting so
15 hard to get this gas to shipping ports on the east coast?
16 The MVP is about money. It's about profits for investors
17 and revenue for our governmental agencies that are
18 overseeing them.

PS2B1-25

19 It should be about the pricelessness of clean,
20 safe water and soil and the pricelessness of doing what is
21 right. MVP has not identified impacts to my drinking water
22 and the water used for our land and cattle. As a whole MVP
23 is already providing information that is not fully
24 addressing stream crossing, wetland destruction, destruction
25 of private wells and springs, potential landslides -- that

PS2B1-25

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding cattle. The EIS provides a discussion of water resources and wetlands in section 4.3, landslides in section 4.2, karst geology in section 4.1, and threatened and endangered species in section 4.7.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-25
cont'd

1 destruction of karst geology, natural habitats of endangered
2 plants and animals. Need I go any further?
3 Why should I trust them to be honest about what
4 they found on my particular parcel of land and why should I
5 trust their findings that they present to FERC to be honest?
6 MVP representatives -- once we agreed to do not only a
7 survey for the actual land but to do surveys for
8 archeological findings, springs, endangered plants and
9 species on our particular land.
10 They spent a total of less than 5 working days to
11 collect that data on our property. How much time have they
12 invested in looking at those same items in our state forests
13 and other land not owned by private citizens?

PS2B1-26

14 We have two springs just in one area of the
15 pipeline that are currently used to provide clean water to
16 our cattle and drinking water to our well. Did I stand a
17 chance of being polluted if not destroyed once the blasting
18 starts? MVP has yet to even acknowledge the existence of
19 those water sources on our land.
20 We purchased our land in hopes of creating a
21 sanctuary for my husband who is now a disabled veteran,
22 traumatic brain injury and PTSD -- those are the small
23 physical tolls he's paid. This is the place we hoped to
24 finally escape a world of conflict, crisis and destruction
25 and recoup from 30 years serving his country and the Special

PS2B1-26

Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

1 Forces.

2 We both envisioned our families, children and
3 generations to come and join the natural beauty, solitude
4 and safety of our 187 acres. Can we provide financially
5 from MVP? Money is not a person's only gauge of worth.
6 Honesty, safety and a future for our state and generations
7 to come are priceless.

PS2B1-27

8 I am asking that FERC deny MVP the construction
9 of this pipeline. It is not just about money, it's about
10 the safety of our community. It's about keeping our
11 environment clean and useable for future generations, thank
12 you.

PS2B1-27

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. The Commission would determine if the projects should be authorized, based on the consolidated record.

PS2B1-28

13 MR. HILL: Jordan Hill. According to an economic
14 benefit report the development of the proposed Mountain
15 Valley Pipeline Project could result in more than 500
16 million dollars in construction spending, 4,000 direct and
17 indirect jobs and more than 40 million dollars in tax
18 revenues for the state of West Virginia.

PS2B1-28

Comments noted.

19 Once the project is operational West Virginia
20 counties along the route will continue to receive property
21 tax revenues generating an estimated nearly 17 million
22 dollars to county governments which is something that
23 Nicholas County and the other counties throughout the whole
24 state desperately need right now.

25 We have had decline in our coal industry and so

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

PS2B1-28
cont'd

1 we could certainly use more jobs which would create more tax
2 revenue by a bigger tax base, that's it.

3 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:00
4 p.m.)

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 1 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

15

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Summersville, West Virginia

16 Date: November 2, 2016

17 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

18 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

19 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

20 of the proceedings.

21

22

23

24 Gaynell Catherine

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2B - ROOM 2

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 Office of Energy Projects
4 - - - - - x
5 Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC Docket No. CP16-10-000
6 Equitrans, LP Docket No. CP16-13-000
7 - - - - - x
8 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PROJECT
9 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT
10 Nicholas County High School
11 30 Grizzly Road
12 Summersville, West Virginia 26651
13 Wednesday, November 2, 2016
14 A public verbal comment session on the Draft EIS was
15 held, pursuant to notice, starting at 5 p.m.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

1 VERBAL COMMENT SESSION

2 FERC: If you could provide your full last
3 name. If you could spell your full and last name. If
4 you're with an organization if you could indicate that by
5 abbreviation and if you're a landowner, if you could provide
6 your address and if you're ready.

7 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Maury Johnson. M A U
8 R Y, Johnson, J O H N S O N. I'm from Monroe County. The
9 pipeline comes really close to my house, across our farm
10 for about two thousand feet. I live at 3227 Ellisons Ridge
11 Road. Near Greenville. I'm with Creek Watershed
12 Association, Preserve Monroe, Save Monroe, Power and a
13 number of other different groups. So, here's my comments.

PS2B2-1

14 First, I'd like to say that this pretend
15 listening session is a farce. As is the recently issued
16 DEIS for the MVP which I call the great works of fiction by

PS2B2-2

17 FERC. Many issues and data that has been provided to FERC
18 is not included or simply ignored. For example, to list
19 zero springs and swaths, Page 4-7, Table 4.31-2, in Monroe
20 County when dozens upon dozens of springs or swaths in or
21 near the MVP corridor have been reported and is such an
22 example. Including springs and Karst on my property that
23 has not been included.

24 Recently it came to my attention that on page
25 2-12, table 2.1-5, above ground facilities for the Mountain

PS2B2-1

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions.

PS2B2-2

See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending information about water wells and springs.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

19

PS2B2-3

1 Valley Project, the one and only mainline valve, MLV number
2 22, also known by some people as an emergency manual shut
3 off valve, is located at mile 185.2, which is near my house.
4 The MLV is located on Wildwater Farm Road. Notice the word,
5 farm, in this road name. It is a dead end spur to Ellisons
6 Ridge Road. CR23/9. It is a very inaccessible area of the
7 county in the best of times and totally inaccessible in
8 severe inclement weather.

9 Due to the time constraints, I will elaborate
10 on my concerns in more depth and will submit the results of
11 a test that I did on how long it takes us to get it there in
12 comments to be submitted later. But to summarize my
13 concerns, this proposed MVP, MLV or emergency manual shut
14 off valve is to be located at the end of a dead end road
15 which is extremely narrow and windy. The Ellisons Ridge
16 Road and especially the Wildwater Farm Road could become
17 impassable for days or even weeks. More than a week in
18 heavy snow.

19 The Greenville side of the Ellisons Ridge Road
20 becomes very icy often in wintertime due to its Northern
21 exposure. There is also the issue of the dirt road section
22 of Ellisons Ridge and Wildwater Farm Road becoming very
23 muddy and rutted in the spring/fall and becoming almost
24 impassable. I've actually seen it impassable by even four
25 wheel drive vehicles.

PS2B2-3

As stated in section 4.8 and 4.12 of the EIS, the MLVs would be equipped with valve actuators for remote operation.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2B2-3
cont'd

1 Hans Creek Road is among the last paved roads
2 in Monroe County to be cleared during winter snow storms.
3 Let me stress again, the Ellisons Ridge and Wildwater Farm
4 Roads are both very narrow, mostly dirt mountainous roads,
5 impassable many times during severe weather. Not a good
6 road even in the best of times. But an MLV or an emergency
7 shut off valve at the end of this road is simply crazy.
8 Actually it's insane or inept. This is the MLV, emergency
9 shut off valve that would affect Peters Mountain and the
10 Jefferson National Forest into Giles County and the
11 Appalachian trail in Monroe and Giles County. The nearest
12 MLV to the MLV in Monroe County is at 198.5 in Giles County;
13 the other side of the forest. The one at ML MP 171 in
14 Summers County, West Virginia, is a distance away. I also
15 wonder if these are located in remote locations as well.

16 FERC: All right. Thank you, sir.

17 MS. LYONS: My name is Kimberly Lyons, K I M
18 B E R L Y. L Y O N S.. I am a landowner at 6700 Tioga
19 Road., Tioga, West Virginia. My property line extends from
20 Nicholas County into Webster County. That's the Nicholas
21 County address. Oh. I just start talking? All right.
22 Well, I have a couple questions or comments.

PS2B2-4

23 First, you need to have more user-friendly maps
24 because those are mainly CAD with aerial image overlays, and
25 those are very difficult for people who do not do GIS and

PS2B2-4

The statements regarding maps are noted. The maps contained in appendix B of the EIS are on a topographic background.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV – Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

21

PS2B2-4
cont'd

1 mrapping to understand. There's also no real reference map
2 for them to get a sense of their space. And I do mapping
3 for a living, so a map is only good as the information it
4 provides, and those are poor maps. I would get a new map
5 maker. Not me, because I would be biased. This is not a
6 plus for employment.

7 So, I have a couple questions first regarding
8 your river crossings.

9 FERC: So, we're not here to answer questions.

10 MS. LYONS: You can't?

11 FERC: No. Because the nature of the DEIS is
12 that it's still in the process.

13 MS. LYONS: In the workings?

14 FERC: Yeah. Yes, ma'am. And so, it's not
15 final.

16 MS. LYONS: It's not an EIS, I should have
17 remembered that.

18 FERC: So, but what you can do as a comment is
19 pose your questions. And then what will happen is the
20 transcripts will be provided within the final EIS and then
21 those questions that you pose in this comment period will be
22 responded to.

PS2B2-5

23 MS. LYONS: All right. Well, my sister is a
24 raft guide and so with the Gauley River crossing if it is
25 during the fall season not only are you going to have issues

PS2B2-5

Section 4.8 of the final EIS has been revised to discuss river rafting on the Gauley River. Visual impacts are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

22

PS2B2-5
cont'd

1 with dam releases messing up all of your equipment in the
2 process, you are going to disrupt a very sensitive tourism
3 business. Because they only do work on dam release days
4 from the summer soleil, and that brings in a lot as well as
5 local festivals and tourism for the county. You also have a
6 proposed site for work along it, which is during -- from me
7 it looks like the left descending bank.

8 There is a large area lining the river with a
9 small buffer area that's going to be a temporary work site.
10 And that also, any type of viewshed analysis that could
11 really affect the quality of river rafting down that area
12 from erosion water inputs, but as well as the way that it
13 looks to the people who float by there. Just because that's
14 a big money maker for our county and Fayette County that's
15 non-extraction, what this county really needs. Actually any
16 type of viewshed analysis would be really nice because we
17 do, I noticed it's going through some other counties that
18 have areas that have a lot of scenic overlooks that that's
19 really going to effect.

PS2B2-6

20 Also the type of remediation that will occur on
21 the temporary work sites. Having information on that would
22 be really nice because some of the areas are forested
23 currently and if those need to be unforested, will you
24 replant? Will you replant natives? Will you just do a
25 grass-ling cover? Things like that that could really effect

PS2B2-6

As stated in section 2.3.3 of the EIS, ATWS would be used only during construction of the projects. After pipeline installations, all of the ATWS would be restored to their pre-construction condition and use. In open, agricultural, and developed and residential land use areas, construction impacts from use of ATWS would be short-term, as these areas would be revegetated in a few years. However, in forest, impacts from use of ATWS would be long-term, as it would take many years for trees to re-establish and mature. Trees would naturally re-establish ATWS, Mountain Valley would not plant trees.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2B2-7

1 the area. I personally would like more information on how
2 the river crossings are actually going to work because to
3 get under the river channel you're going to have to get into
4 the water table as well as crossing through others, several
5 wetlands; and any type of leaks with methane are really
6 going to affect that. Where it's underground there's going
7 to be a lot methane outcasting.

8 I feel like those were my main comments and
9 it's mostly with water and needing better, more
10 user-friendly maps. That's it.

11 FERC: Thank you.

12 MS. SPINKS: My name is Georgiana Spinks, that
13 is G E O R G I A N A. Last name, S as in Sam, P as in Paul,
14 I, N as in Nancy, K, S as in Sam. I'm an individual
15 representative, not with any group. I am a landowner here
16 in Nicholas County. My address is 4207 Little Beaver Road.
17 Calvin, West Virginia. 26660. I'll just go ahead with my
18 comments.

PS2B2-8

19 Concerns that I have regarding the Mountain
20 Valley Pipeline. The current route involves crossing the
21 Elk, Gauley and Greenbrier Rivers. This involves the
22 possible contamination for drinking water supplies for more
23 than half of the State of West Virginia. Not to mention the
24 small tributaries and private water wells for residents
25 along the way. The impact for during construction of the

PS2B2-7

Waterbody and wetland crossing methods are discussed in sections 2 and 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

PS2B2-8

Mountain Valley would cross the Elk, Gauley, and Greenbrier Rivers with dry methods. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2B2-8
cont'd

1 pipeline and risks for breach of the pipeline after it is
2 operational for the population whose water is directly
3 affected must be included in the environmental impact
4 studies and it is not in the draft environmental impact
5 studies.

PS2B2-9

6 The proposed method for crossing the major
7 waterways involves a technique known as Open Cut Wet
8 Crossing. This technique is extremely invasive and causes a
9 great amount of sedimentation and turbidity during
10 construction. The DEIS does not address the impact to
11 aquatic life from this method of water crossing. The
12 aquatic life in our river and streams is one of our greatest
13 resources for eco-tourism in the state. Not to mention the
14 fact that we support rare and fragile aquatic life such as
15 the water dog and the native brook trout.

PS2B2-10

16 The MVP proposes to fill in 44 wetlands in its
17 path. Forty-four is a tremendous amount of precious
18 wetlands. These wetlands are proposed to be a protected and
19 natural resource and they are not even addressed in the
20 DEIS. How can FERC consider a study that does not even

PS2B2-11

21 address this very important environmental impact area? In
22 short, the DEIS does not address several main points
23 concerning the water and aquatic life impact, both during
24 construction and the risks after operational. Supplemental
25 EEIS studies to supply the missing facts are needed in order

PS2B2-9

All rivers would be crossed using dry-trench methods. See the response to comment FA11-15 regarding open-cut waterbody crossings. Sedimentation and turbidity impacts to aquatic resources are addressed in section 4.6.2 of the EIS.

PS2B2-10

See the response to comment IND209-1 regarding the permanent fill of wetlands.

PS2B2-11

The final EIS has been revised to address supplemental information.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

PS2B2-11
cont'd

1 for FERC to appropriately consider this proposal and
2 determine the impact to the environment. The point of
3 conducting environmental impact studies is to, in fact,
4 determine the impact to the environment, not to ignore the
5 basic information that would do irreversible damage, that
6 the construction of the pipeline would have. That's all.

7
8 <>

9 MR. HUDSON: My name is John Hudson. H U D S O

PS2B2-12

10 N. I'm here representing Teamsters Local 175 out of
11 Charleston, West Virginia. We're for this project for
12 several reasons. The economic value that it will give to
13 the state of West Virginia, and our members working. We
14 have trained qualified members that do nothing but work on
15 pipelines for a living. We run training schools and
16 environmental schools, safety schools to where these lines
17 can be built with as little disturbance to mother nature as
18 we can. All of our members live and work in this area.

19 We think that it's imperative that with coal
20 being what it is today and all the pollution and things,
21 that natural gas the new way to go. West Virginia has an
22 abundance of natural gas. We feel like we can switch the
23 jobs that people have been working in the coal mines and put
24 them to work building these pipelines and things, and giving
25 them a good living. We have all kinds of benefits; pension,

PS2B2-12 Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

26

1 insurance and so forth. When these pipelines come through
2 the area, it's not usual for towns to come back and tell us
3 that the pipeline has put tens of millions of dollars into
4 their communities from buying gas, buying supplies, going
5 motels, eating. All kinds of things that the people do
6 themselves and then the pipeline companies on top of that,
7 buying all of their local stuff to build the pipeline there;
8 welding rod, et cetera, et cetera. Things like that. It
9 amounts to a tremendous economic benefit and West Virginia
10 needs that right now, as the whole country does. We think
11 we can cut down on the carbon benefit as they say because
12 natural gas burns 30 times cleaner than coal.

13 With that, we're all for the project, we look
14 forward to working with you guys and the gas companies and
15 the state and all the regulatory things in any way that we
16 can. Appreciate it. We've got our safety hats.

17 (Thereupon, at 7 p.m., the public verbal comment
18 session concluded.)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS2B – Nicholas County High School Summersville, WV– Room 2 – November 2, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

27

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Summersville, West Virginia

16 Date: November 2, 2016

17 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
18 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
19 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
20 of the proceedings.

21

22

23

24 Daniel Hawkins

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 2

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. BETTS: I'm Charles Betts. And I am from

3 3265 Nikkel Lane in Blacksburg. I am not a long-term,

4 deep-roots Virginian. I spent 39 years in the military and

5 moved here 10 years ago.

6 I oppose the current plan for the pipeline for

PS3A1-1 | 7 several reasons. One, the plan is quite fluid and

8 everchanging. In the military, I wasn't quite used to that.

9 Their routes appear not to be the best routes for the least

PS3A1-2 | 10 impact. I was not pleased to see a 50-foot easement may

11 become a 500-foot corridor through the National Forest. A

12 500-foot corridor becomes a dam break rather than a leak in

13 the dam.

14 And the other thing that I have some concern

PS3A1-3 | 15 about is the use of the product as it comes in, natural gas.

16 It appears to be mostly overseas sales with a very minimum

17 amount available to southeastern United States, western

18 Virginia and Virginia. It's kind of a cost benefit

19 analysis, as far as I'm concerned.

20 There's a tremendous impact for this pipeline on

21 the environment, and this is one of the most beautiful parts

PS3A1-4 | 22 of our country. In particular, a 500-foot corridor would

23 have a significant impact on wildlife, scenery and

PS3A1-5 | 24 particularly on those private property owners who are

25 deep-root property owners been here. I have got friends who

PS3A1-1 The route changes filed by Mountain Valley on October 14 and 20, 2016 mostly concerned minor route variations to address landowner concerns and alternatives recommended in the draft EIS. The current proposed route was analyzed in the final EIS.

PS3A1-2 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest. Mountain Valley proposes to use a nominal 125-foot-wide construction right-of-way and a 50-foot-wide operational easement.

PS3A1-3 Section 1.2 of the EIS provides a list of the subscribers for both the MVP and the EEP. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-4 The EIS concluded that the project would not have significant impacts on most environmental resources. See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest. See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife. Visual impacts are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS3A1-5 Landowner impacts are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 3

PS3A1-5 cont'd | 1 has properties been in their family since the late 1700s,
2 and that's quite an impact.

3 | I see it as benefiting a very few, creating a few
4 jobs, but at a cost to me that is a little unreasonable. I
PS3A1-6 | 5 don't deny that someone would make some money off of it, but
6 I don't think the typical Virginian and the population of
7 the southeast is gonna be benefited by it. Thank you.

8 | MS. BETTS: Jacqueline Betts. I am not a
9 landowner. So I come as a concerned citizen. I own no land
10 affected by the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposed route
11 through Virginia. The concerns I have are multifold.

PS3A1-7 | 12 First, who is benefiting from this venture? It
13 appears that those invested in the proposed pipeline are the
PS3A1-8 | 14 big winners. We're being told that the natural gas that
15 will be transported will be sold outside of our country.

PS3A1-9 | 16 Second, our environment will be greatly affected
17 and this resource which state all aspects of the region come
18 into play from the many animal species to the physical
19 alterations of streams, mountainsides and caves, just to
20 name a few.

PS3A1-10 | 21 And thirdly, it seems that private citizens and
22 landowners are the big losers in all of this. No longer can
23 they feel secure in processing prized property that they are
24 proud to own and manage.

25 | In summary, I'm having a difficult time assuring

PS3A1-6 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See also the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PS3A1-7 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-8 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-9 The EIS concluded that the project would not have significant impacts on most environmental resources (excluding the clearing of forest). Caves are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS; water resources in section 4.3.

PS3A1-10 Landowner impacts are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 4

1 my children and grandchildren that [what] they may try to
2 achieve in this great nation is safe. Distrust is becoming
3 the norm and freedoms are being infringed upon. Thank you.

4 MR. GIVENS: My name is Clarence Givens. I
PS3A1-11 5 object to the pipeline coming through the area of Giles
6 County and the village of Newport. The pipeline should not
7 go through designated historic districts. The National
8 Historic Preservation Act--we thought--was supposed to
9 provide some protection for historic districts, and of
10 course, that's why the historic districts were formed.

11 There is an alternative route that this pipeline
PS3A1-12 12 could go through, known as Hybrid Alternate 1A, that would
13 not go through any historic districts. I believe there are
14 eight historic districts that would be affected if this
15 pipeline goes the way it's now planned.

16 It appears to me that the Environmental Impact
PS3A1-13 17 Statement draft does not specify what MVP, the builder of
18 this pipeline, would do to protect the water resources in
19 our area. And that's very important for agriculture arming
20 operations that are still going on in that area, and have
21 been for a couple hundred years.

22 It's not been demonstrated to me that there's
PS3A1-14 23 been a demonstrated need for a pipeline. Studies of
24 pipelines that are now in existence have indicated that the
25 pipelines in existence can handle movement of natural gas

PS3A1-11 Historic Districts are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A1-12 Section 3 of the final EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative.

PS3A1-13 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming.

PS3A1-14 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 without building all this brand-new infrastructure that's
2 tearing up our environment, and is proposing to tear up the
3 village of Newport.

4 There is a great lack of information in the
5 Environmental Impact Statement that pertains to the eastern
6 end of Giles County where this pipeline's gonna go. It's
7 very -- well, it just keeps on missing. Every time MVP and
8 their contractors put out new information, they keep on
9 missing possible affected properties.

10 MR. LIONBERGER: My name is Samuel L. Lionberger,
11 Jr. My address is 55 Harbor View Circle. I live in
12 Penhook, Virginia on Smith Mountain Lake. I own my own
13 property, but I don't think we're technically affected by
14 the proposed gas line, but I'm been involved in economic
15 development here in the Roanoke Valley for over 40 years,
16 maybe over 50 years.

17 I'm a retired commercial builder, and I've also
18 been active in economic development for most of my career.
19 The issue of constructing a new natural gas pipeline into
20 our depressed area has drawn a lot of interest, both pro and
21 con. I hope my thoughts this evening will be helpful.

22 First, as you and the members of the FERC
23 Commission know, any time there is a new road or a major
24 development or something that changes the landscape, there
25 are people who object when they feel it has some degree of

PS3A1-15

PS3A1-15

The final EIS has been revised to include supplemental information filed after the issuance of the draft.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

6

1 impact on their property. Concerns vary from grading and
2 drainage issues to increased traffic, etcetera.

3 From my years of experience, I have found their
4 objection is because they are comfortable with theirs and
5 their surrounding properties as it exists, but they cannot
6 envision the proposed development and its economic impact on
7 their area. A common concern is that property values will
8 go down. Any good appraiser will tell you that history has
9 shown, with minor exceptions, that such development doesn't
10 change values hardly at all when completed.

11 There is a strong and an accurate concern that we
12 need to have more economic development in our area to create
13 new jobs and a new tax base to support our schools and our
14 public resources. However, when it affects their own
15 property, people object for the mostly unfounded concerns
16 that I stated just before.

17 Thus, it is very difficult sometimes for elected
18 officials to create needed economic growth when such
19 personal objections impede it. A common argument you have
20 heard is "well, you know, we really do need that, but not
21 across my land or next to me." Well, the same goes for this
22 proposed natural gas pipeline. Most people who oppose such
23 economic development projects do so primarily for personal
24 reasons, and are not considering the significant positive
25 benefit it will mean to both attracting new businesses, as

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 well as retaining others.

2 Yes, there will be some temporary disruption to
3 the individual properties as the line is installed. And as
4 you well know, there are excellent regulations enforced
5 during the construction period that protect environmental
6 impacts. These are of a temporary nature and when done, the
7 areas will often be returned to very close to the way the
8 property was prior to the project.

9 We must, as a state and a community, realize that
10 infrastructure improvements are critical to attracting new
11 and keeping existing businesses. You certainly would not
12 build a new manufacturing plant if there were not water,
13 sewer and power available. And now, the same goes for
14 natural gas availability.

15 Successful economic development starts with an
16 attitude of positive support for growth. If we only look at
17 our own property and for personal or political reasons,
18 block improvements and economic infrastructure projects such
19 as this pipeline, we send a message that we are not
20 receptive to new growth of business and industry to create
21 our needed jobs. This is a true fact, and if not approved,
22 the area will continue to decline economically.

23 I'm sure you will get comments from environmental
24 groups opposing this project, but also know that
25 well-designed and well-managed projects can create economic

PS3A1-16

PS3A1-16

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-16
cont'd | 1 growth where environmental protection can also co-exist for
| 2 the mutual benefit of our communities and our population.
| 3 Thank you for considering my views.

4 MR. WARD: Benjamin Harrison Ward. I am a
5 business owner. My business is located approximately on the
6 corner of Route 419 and Tinsley Road, Bent Mountain
7 Agricultural Corporation and Bent Mountain Bistro. And I am
8 one of the largest employers, if not the largest employer in
9 the Bent Mountain area.

PS3A1-17 | 10 I'm here because I believe that FERC has not
| 11 demonstrated a need for the pipeline, as identified in their
| 12 draft Environmental Impact Statement. I feel like the taps
| 13 at Webster and Roanoke are proposed taps there are nothing

PS3A1-18 | 14 but window-dressing. I think that a lot of the conclusions
| 15 that were reached in the draft environmental impact
| 16 statement lack credibility.

PS3A1-19 | 17 As a business owner, I have to comply with all of
| 18 Virginia's water and environmental standards. I have to
| 19 meet the same water standards as a municipality serving
| 20 water to the public, and as such, that involves monthly
| 21 water testing. And I'm familiar with the geology in that
| 22 area, and I think that based on my personal knowledge of
| 23 Bent Mountain and the Bent Mountain area, I disagree
| 24 strongly with the conclusions reached in that draft
| 25 environmental study.

PS3A1-17 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS3A1-18 See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The conclusions in the EIS are based on facts.

PS3A1-19 The permits that would be required are addressed in section 1.5 of the EIS. Geology is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-20

1 And I feel like the process has been somewhat
2 undermined, I think. And I'm not very pleased with this
3 entire process. I feel like it's kind of a subversion of
4 our democracy, and I'm also against taking people's lands
5 under imminent domain when I don't feel there's a clear
6 public need. And hopefully the Commissioners will not go
7 along with this, or the bulk of this. Thanks.

PS3A1-21

8 MR. BAILEY: I'm Douglas Michael Bailey. I do
9 not own land. Well, first off, can I hand this to you,
10 would that be easier? I'll hand this to you. I would like
11 to add the attachment, which is, I would like to see the
12 interstate, the center lane of interstates, being considered
13 as possible sites, to eliminate imminent domain.

14 And then I have three lines of comments here. I
15 will give them to you. Thank you very much.

16 MS. DUERK: I am Barbara Duerk. I am not a
17 landowner. But I am a bicyclist. And I understand the
18 economic impact of investments and bicycling facilities is
19 substantiated by local trail investment, shared use paths,
20 like New River Trail or rail-to-trail conversion is an
21 economic engine in southwest Virginia. I know from using
22 the Roanoke Valley Greenway system that multi-use trails can
23 be located and are adjacent to gas lines, petroleum
24 pipelines and are constructed as part of storm water
25 projects.

PS3A1-20

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. The Commission would decide if there is public need to support the projects.

PS3A1-21

Section 3.4 of the EIS provides a discussion of a highway alternative. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-22

1 The cost benefit ratio of adding a multi-use
2 corridor with the construction of the pipeline can be
3 financially feasible and will be a public relations
4 "together we can" project. Somebody said, "well, they can't
5 do it. They don't have the money." I'm hearing that the
6 cost is not a barrier.

7 I think to address the water runoff and the
8 topography, that they need to build bridges or trellises
9 across the valleys. If they can't do that, then use
10 cantilevers on the bridges that are already there, that they
11 need to use existing paths instead of funding new
12 right-of-ways.

13 And I have pictures here that show shared use
14 utilities. This one is Verizon, the lights, electricity and
15 telephone. This is a picture of a shared use path. It's on
16 Mill Mountain, which is in the center of the city. It is an
17 AEP right-of-way. It has a pipeline on it. And then this
18 is the multi-use path that has people on it. So pipeline,
19 electricity, all are right together.

20 This is a picture of the Tinker Creek Greenway
21 that shows the pipeline. It shows the railroad. It shows
22 the greenway that is a multi-use path that's shared by
23 walkers, bicyclists and horses. And then this is the Tinker
24 Creek Greenway which is the water. So the pipeline exists
25 within the watershed without any problem. It's been there

PS3A1-22

The statements regarding creating a multi-use corridor are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-23 1 for years and there's been no noted difficulty.
2 This 500-foot right-of-way that evidently the
3 U.S. Forest Service is mentioning is unrealistic. It's
4 negative. We need to add a side path, a multi-use path to
5 make this pipeline cost benefit ratio. We've seen in Alaska

PS3A1-24 6 where they can be run above-ground, so they don't need to
7 interfere with the topography, and we've seen in Europe
8 where they can be economic and landscape attractive --
9 economic beneficial and landscape attractive.

10 MS. HAVERTY: My name is Georgia Haverty. The
11 pipeline does cross my property at 412 Doe Creek Farm Road.

12 MR. MARSH: My name's Campbell Marsh.

13 MS. HAVERTY: My name is Georgia Haverty. My
14 address is 412 Doe Creek Farm Road, Pembroke, Virginia. I
15 am strongly opposed to the Mountain Valley Pipeline for

PS3A1-25 16 several reasons. Number one, the MVP as currently proposed
17 runs through the middle of my property, Doe Creek Farm,
18 which is a 400-acre cattle farm, "you pick" apple orchard,
19 dog-boarding kennel and wedding venue.

20 The Virginia Department of Historical Resources
21 has determined that the entire farm is eligible for historic
22 designation under agriculture and architecture period of
23 significance 1883 to 1966. The water supply comes from one
24 mountain spring, which has been the sole water source for
25 the farm since the 1800s. Construction of this pipeline may

PS3A1-23 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding a 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PS3A1-24 An aboveground pipeline would not be safe.

PS3A1-25 Section 3.5 of the final EIS has been updated with new information regarding this parcel. As discussed in section 4.10, the Doe Creek Farm was previously recorded as historic architectural site #35-18, which was evaluated as eligible for the NRHP. The farm house is about 479 feet away from the proposed pipeline. The Virginia SHPO agrees with Mountain Valley that the MVP would have no adverse effects on site #35-18. It is unlikely that the pipeline would destroy the spring or water supply to the farm; see section 4.3 of the EIS. Any impacts on domestic water supplies would be repaired, or the supplies replaced by Mountain Valley. It is unlikely that a buried pipeline would affect the business operations at the farm (see sections 2, 4.2 and 4.8 of the EIS).

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		12
PS3A1-25 cont'd	1 destroy the spring and therefore all businesses, not to 2 mention two family homes.	
PS3A1-26	3 The numbers of customers and guests near the 4 proposed pipeline have defined Doe Creek Farm as a 5 high-consequence area. This means entire wedding parties 6 and families and children who take field trips to pick 7 apples and enjoy the farm experience are now within a blast 8 zone. If customers stop booking weddings or coming to pick 9 apples because of the pipeline, a high consequence area 10 won't matter, but again, businesses will be destroyed. If 11 businesses are destroyed, my family and I will have to move.	
PS3A1-27	12 Unfortunately, property values will plummet with the 13 pipeline installation, so moving will not be possible.	
PS3A1-28	14 These consequences are unmitigable.	
PS3A1-29	15 Number two. DEIS amendments will irreparably 16 harm the Jefferson National Forest. These include creating 17 a 500-foot wide utility corridor, degrading the forest and 18 viewsheds. Relaxing restrictions that protect soil and 19 riparian conditions, cutting down currently protected 20 old-growth forests, and permitting the MVP to cross the 21 Appalachian National Scenic Trail while downgrading scenic 22 integrity and restoration. These actions are unmitigable.	
PS3A1-30	23 Number three. The geology and topography of this 24 area have been studied and reported as an extremely 25 hazardous and dangerous no-build zone for the MVP. The	

PS3A1-26	See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.
PS3A1-27	High Consequence Areas (HCAs) are discussed in section 4.12.1 of the EIS.
PS3A1-28	See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
PS3A1-29	In the EIS, FS no longer proposes to reallocate any lands to the Rx 5C-Designated Utility Corridor. There would not be a 500-foot wide corridor identified for future collocation opportunities. See section 4.8.2.6 for further discussion. The FS has worked with Mountain Valley to develop project design features, mitigation measures and monitoring procedures to minimize the impacts to the resources those standards were designed to protect. These mitigation measures and monitoring procedures are described in the POD.
PS3A1-30	See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 Kastning Report on geohazards of the proposed MVP have been
2 given to FERC. If this report continues to be ignored by
3 the Commission, each member and all employees of FERC, who
4 have been made aware of it, could and should be held
5 accountable, and personally liable. Pipeline construction
6 through this geology and topography is unmitigable.

7 Here are copies of the karst reports in three
8 forms. I do still want to give these to you because
9 evidently nobody's reading it.

10 MS. SCHLAUDECKER: My name is Sandra
11 Schlaudecker. The pipeline does not cross my land.

12 MR. MARSH: Campbell Marsh.

PS3A1-31

13 MS. SCHLAUDECKER: According to the National
14 Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, FERC must define the purpose
15 and need for a proposed project in the DEIS. According to a
16 recent released study, September 16th, by the
17 Massachusetts-based Synapse Energy Economics, the ACP and
18 MVP would financially benefit the utility companies and
19 investors, while burdening customers with higher bills to
20 cover the costs of the unnecessary construction.

PS3A1-31

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. Non-environmental FERC may address the Synapse report in the Project Order.

PS3A1-32

21 An equal or greater amount of natural gas can be
22 supplied by existing and upgraded pipelines and a lower cost
23 with far fewer impacts. The ACP and MVP cannot be said to
24 serve the greater public good. Existing pipelines can
25 supply more than enough fuel to power the region through

PS3A1-32

Section 3 of the EIS provides an assessment of using existing pipelines as an alternative to the projects.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		14
PS3A1-32 cont'd	1	2030.
PS3A1-33	2	By FERC failing to comply with NEPA's mandates,
	3	horrible impacts to national forestland and private lands
PS3A1-34	4	will take place. Imminent domain will have to be used to
	5	obtain land that owners do not want taken. In the FERC DEIS
	6	DO272 September 16 book on Pages ES-14 under Major
	7	Conclusion, it is stated, "we determined that construction
	8	and operation of the project would result in limited adverse
	9	environmental impacts with the except of the impact on
	10	forests." On Page ES-7 under Land Use and Visual Resources,
	11	it says "the MVP pipeline route would cross mostly forests,
	12	81%," so if my math is correct, 81% of 301 miles equals 242
	13	miles. How can such a project be considered?
	14	NEPA also requires agencies to consider
	15	environmental impacts of a proposed project and make that
	PS3A1-35	16
17		rent intervenor, I receive all the FERC filings. It is
18		almost impossible to locate a document due to the horrible
19		way the FERC library is organized.
PS3A1-36	20	Also, since there have been significant details
	21	added since the DEIS was finished, the final comments, date
	22	of December 22nd, 2016, should be extended. It is not fair
	23	to have less than the normal 60 days to research the newest
	24	filings by MVP. It is my understanding to date the entire
	25	route has not been surveyed. Again, more time is needed.

PS3A1-33 See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. Impacts to the Jefferson National Forest are discussed throughout section 4 of the EIS, particularly in section 4.8.

PS3A1-34 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS3A1-35 The statements regarding e-Library are noted.

PS3A1-36 See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA3-1 regarding recent filings and the comment review period. The FERC's standard comment period for a draft EIS is 45 days. The comment period for the MVP was extended to 90 days.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-37 1 Filings have shown shortfalls in MVP's data, including
2 effects of blasting, sedimentation, private wells and septic
3 systems, communities and landowners, steep slopes and stream
4 crossings, to name a few.

5 It is the FERC's job to make sure all of these
6 areas are adequately and correctly addressed and that that
7 information is available and is searchable and in a readable
8 manner. Many things have been asked of MVP, many things
9 have not been answered, or poorly answered with information
10 missing.

11 It is my understanding the FERC has said MVP can
12 submit information prior to construction, but how can a
13 scoping meeting such as this have public input when the
14 information is not available?

PS3A1-38 15 Erosion is a huge concern. MVP and the FERC have
16 assured the public that this will not be a problem, yet we
17 have seen photos taken by drones of the catastrophic erosion
18 that is taking place just west of Harrisburg from the gas
19 pipe used for the Celanese Plant. How can we trust when we
20 are being told -- when it seems we have been lied to, at
21 least in this case?

PS3A1-39 22 The terrain the MVP will have to traverse is even
23 steeper and much longer. Running pipeline through karst
24 topography when a lead scientist in this field, Dr.
25 Kastning, has said this should not be done due to caves,

PS3A1-37 FERC staff examined all of Mountain Valley's filings and has asked for additional information and clarifications throughout the environmental review process. The EIS provides an assessment of blasting and steep slopes in section 4.1, wells and stream crossings in section 4.3, and landowners in sections 4.8 and 4.9. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the final EIS.

PS3A1-38 See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PS3A1-39 Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-39
cont'd

1 underground streams, sinkholes and it is absolutely wrong.
2 Some of the leases I have seen allow for anything to be
3 transported in the pipeline.
4 It is my understanding that FERC does not
5 regulate these, whose responsibility is to make sure that

PS3A1-40

6 people notice. While burning natural gas results in CO2,
7 less CO2 than burning coal, the methane that is released in
8 the fracking process and transporting is much worse for
9 creating the greenhouse effect and global warming.

PS3A1-41

10 MR. SHOCKLEY: My name is Jim Shockley. I live
11 at 620 Big Spring Road, Fincastle, Virginia. It's in
12 Botetourt County. I'm vice-president of operations for

13 Roanoke Gas Company. I support the pipeline for several
14 reasons. The pipeline benefits the Roanoke Valley and
15 increases reliability because it provides Roanoke with a
16 third source of natural gas.

17 We believe in the pipelines, the project in
18 itself, because the pipelines are the proven safest mode of
19 transporting fossil fuels across the nation. There've been
20 over 16,000 miles of pipelines installed since the year
21 2000. We also believe the project's good for the region
22 because it will move economically beneficial Marcellus Shale
23 gas and save our customers money, which we'll pass along to
24 them.

25 It will also benefit the area regionally for

PS3A1-40

Climate change is addressed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS3A1-41

Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

17

1 expansion purposes to allow us to serve customers that don't
2 currently have service, with the increased capacity. And it
3 will also bring jobs to the region, so it'll be an economic
4 benefit for increased jobs and tax revenue.

PS3A1-42

5 MS. ECHOLS: We're Earl and Fern Echols, and
6 we're at 362 Blue Grass Trail in Newport. And we are
7 landowners and we was told last week -- we had surveyors to
8 come and surveyed and I met with a young man in the street,
9 and I said with all of this going on out here and this
10 pipeline 65 feet from my living quarters, I don't know if I
11 can tolerate y'all or not.

12 And he said, "Well, if this passes, we'll have to
13 relocate you." And I said, hold it right there. I said, my
14 husband is 80 years old in ill health. I'm 76 and try to
15 keep things afloat, and I am not obligated to pick up and
16 move now. And I don't think my home should be taken.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me stop you right there. No
18 homes will be taken. The pipeline company's only authorized
19 to negotiate an easement of land. You will never be removed
20 from your home.

21 MS. ECHOLS: Honey, what about the 65 feet from
22 my home? That's it. I've got an acre of lane. And that's
23 it.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. And that's what you have
25 to negotiate with the company is for that 65 feet

PS3A1-42

Mountain Valley has told FERC staff that no property owners would be required to vacate their residences during project construction.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

18

1 right-of-way.

2 MS. ECHOLS: I don't know what you're saying,
3 "negotiating", what fashion?

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Typically--this is typically,
5 because I don't know your case specifics--typically a
6 pipeline will send out a land agent who will negotiate the
7 purchase of an easement on your land. They will pay you for
8 the easement. In no case do I ever recall anyone, and I've
9 worked for the FERC for 25 years, never in 25 years am I
10 aware of people being moved from their homes, or their homes
11 being taken. That has never happened --

12 MS. ECHOLS: Well, why did he tell me --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: I do not know. He told you
14 something that's not true.

15 MS. ECHOLS: I'm glad he caught me in a good
16 frame of mind that day. Because I might not've been --
17 honey, we've been in our home since '69.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: We are not moving you from your
19 home. The company is not authorized to move you from your
20 home. In 25 years of working for this agency, I've never
21 seen that happen.

22 MS. ECHOLS: If you put that pipe up beside my
23 house, and it's 65 feet, the center of the pipeline is 65 --
24 will I still live there with it?

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: There are thousands, or hundreds

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

19

1 of thousands or millions of people do. There are millions
2 of miles of pipeline in the United States, some are very
3 close to residents and people live in those houses.

4 MS. ECHOLS: Well, will we stay there while
5 they're tearing up there?

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Of course.

7 MR. ECHOLS: I'm not going anywhere.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Did I help you there?

9 MS. ECHOLS: You helped me, but I hope it made me
10 feel better, because -- but I am worried about that
11 pipeline, but what's to be will be. I told that young man
12 --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Like I said, millions of miles of
14 pipeline in the United States. Millions of miles. Right
15 next to houses. Nothing ever happens.

16 MS. ECHOLS: I cannot believe that he told me
17 that and you know, my husband is a grave diabetic --

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: This is why -- I'm also diabetic
19 -- this is why you come to these meetings so we can tell you
20 the truth.

21 MS. ECHOLS: And my husband's levels are up every
22 week, and I take him to his doctor. And I told him this
23 morning, I said we're gonna have to call Dr. Bailey. Well,
24 about 30 minutes later, Dr. Bailey called us. His sugar has
25 been sky-high all this week, since that young man told us

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 20

1 that.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Well, hopefully it'll come

3 down now --

4 MS. ECHOLS: I hope it does.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- but I'm reassuring you that you

6 will not be moved from your house.

7 MS. ECHOLS: I don't know why he told me that.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know either. Thank you

9 for your time.

10 MS. ECHOLS: Thank you.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Lynn Williams. Let me

12 count the multitude of ways this pipeline has ruined my day.

13 Five years ago, my home caught on fire and to experience it

14 again, I have no desire. Lightning struck much too closely

15 nearby and I saw my home burn in the blink of an eye. This

16 pipeline will traverse mountains and caves, all natural

17 beauty that to us the Lord gave. Our soils slip along our

18 less-than-stable slopes, and Lord, no earthquakes are

19 imminent, we hope.

20 For Giles County has been a Virginia quake center

21 until Louisa County surged ahead as the winner. This

22 pipeline will split my lovely community in two, pushing

23 friends from homes not knowing what to do. About all this,

24 there is no doubt, we plan to sue over the injustice done to

25 us right out of the blue. There is no moral right to

PS3A1-43

PS3A1-43

Caves, steep slopes and earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-44

PS3A1-44

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. The historic covered bridges of Newport are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-44
cont'd

1 utilize imminent domain when it is for nothing more than
2 private gain.
3 I'm proud to say Newport is a unique little town
4 and we will fight to keep it from being brought down. Of
5 Virginia's seven covered bridges, we have three. They are
6 an ultra-important part of our history. "So what?", you
7 federal officials may scoff and say, "They're not in the
8 pipeline's direct pathway." However, they are all in the
9 blast where evacuations are. They're Newport's identity
10 wherever we may run.

11 And about my land, the officials don't
12 understand. No amount of money will alter my stand. The
13 land, like Newport, will always be a part of me. It's
14 strong fibers of fabric within my family's history.

15 My great-great-grandparents built the Methodist
16 church, which the pipeline's route will endanger and

PS3A1-45

17 besmirch. And the greatest concern is our water from wells
18 and springs. The karst makes our streams so lovely, they
19 almost sing.

20 I am Lynn who was worried about water and fire.
21 My family faced ruins in Newport with a fire. 'Twas on
22 April Fool's Day in the year 1902, my family and others were
23 quite blue.

24 For fire had reduced the family home to ash.
25 From the blaze which it sparked in a flash. Much of Newport

PS3A1-45

The pipeline would be about 430 feet away from the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church, and should not affect it. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Karst is discussed in section 4.1.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 was devastated, but we were determined and dedicated.

2 The house was slowly rebuilt since their hope
3 could not be killed. My ancestor returned from the
4 Revolution, had bought the land for his housing solution.

5 He stepped up to the plate, in defense of his
6 property and state. He would want me to make a stand, to
7 protect our beloved family land.

8 The house survived the Civil War when Yanks
9 entered the town's door. I am Price Family Generation
10 Number Seven, to own the land, my little piece of heaven.

11 So with that heritage, I can do less, to fight
12 our most unwelcome guest. About our property and land, we
13 know best, and our government leaders have failed the test.

14 In September we celebrated the Constitution. Our
15 forefathers would be aghast at this solution. For our
16 property is being seized for private gain by our government
17 through eminent domain.

18 The pipeline threatens our water and land and for
19 each, we must take a stand. The MVP is an ill wind that
20 blows no good, and our no has not been understood.

21 From this day, let our voices be heard. The MVP
22 is an idea quite absurd. Let the hills and mountains hear
23 our cry. With eminent domain, I'd rather die.

24 MR. HOFFMAN: Name is Tom Hoffman. I am not a
25 landowner where the pipeline will cross. The first thing I

PS3A1-46

PS3A1-46

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 23

1 want to say is, this is germane to this election and so
2 forth, but when I go in that voting booth on Tuesday, I'll
3 be thinking only about one thing and one thing only. And
4 that's the environment. That's all. I don't care about
5 anything else.

PS3A1-47 | 6 And there's a way out of this madness you know,
7 because there's something called Alternative 1A, which would
8 avoid a lot of the problems that's associated with this
9 pipeline, like the karst and the Appalachian Trail and a
10 number of other things here.

11 Why make it hard for yourself? It's gonna cost a
12 lot more to build like this than it is to build like that.
13 It gotta cost ten times as much. Why make it hard? And the
14 ratepayers are gonna be the ones that pay it, they're not.
15 And there is actually excess pipeline capacity in this state
PS3A1-48 | 16 as it is. They don't need any more pipelines, they can use
17 the ones they've got.

18 And forget about the jobs issue, because there
19 isn't any jobs issue. Pipelines are built by specialized
20 workers, like, welders. They're not your body shop down the
21 street. They're specialized workers who go from one
PS3A1-49 | 22 pipeline to another to another to another. And most of 'em
23 don't live here and the pipeline when it's finished is gonna
24 be controlled and monitored by computers in Pittsburgh, and
25 that's not gonna create any jobs in Virginia either. I mean

PS3A1-47 Section 3 of the EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative.

PS3A1-48 Section 3 of the EIS provides an assessment of using existing pipelines as an alternative to the projects. The Commission would determine the need for the projects.

PS3A1-49 See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia. As stated in section 4.9 of the EIS, local workers would comprise about 25 percent of the workforce during construction.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 24

1 you know --

PS3A1-50 2 And in Giles County, they wanna build it on top
3 of all these caves and underground water and all that kind
4 of stuff -- what do you think happens, you know, if there's
5 some sort of disturbance. And it could cave in, and that's
6 another thing. If the pipeline, that big 42" pipeline were
7 to blow up, it would destroy everything in an 1,100 foot
8 radius. 1,100 feet that way and 1,100 feet -- and that's
9 almost as bad as a suitcase nuke, without the radiation of
10 course. And that's just ridiculous.

PS3A1-51 11 You would ruin Giles County. Giles County gets a
12 lot of income from tourism. They go up to the Cascades and
13 they hike the Appalachian Trail and they go hunting in the
14 national forest. Deer hunting, bear hunting. And they fish
15 and you think anybody from down in Richmond is gonna say,
16 "Hey, let's go up to Giles County and see their brand-new
17 shiny, new pipeline"?

PS3A1-52 18 And 125 -- you started off with 125 feet, the
19 width of it. Then you change your rules in the middle of
20 the game and go to 500 feet. That's two football fields
21 almost. And it's just ridiculous. And then they put a
PS3A1-53 22 utility corridor, so they wanna put another one and another
23 one and another one. How much gas do you need? I mean, for
PS3A1-54 24 crying out loud, it's all gonna be exported to India anyway.
25 MS. PRUNER: It's Carol Pruner. And [the

PS3A1-50 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Caves are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Groundwater is discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-51 Tourism is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-52 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PS3A1-53 In the EIS, FS no longer proposes to reallocate any lands to the Rx 5C-Designated Utility Corridor. There would not be a 500-foot wide corridor identified for future collocation opportunities. See section 4.8.2.6 for further discussion.

PS3A1-54 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-55 | 1 pipeline] is not going across my property. What I want for
2 Virginia and the rest of the world is clean, renewable
3 energy that will not fill the air with pollution. Already
4 more children die from air pollution than any disease.

PS3A1-56 | 5 We do not want a pipeline built over 7,000 acres
6 of forestland. This land is composed of sinkholes, springs
7 and caves that make the pipeline a danger. We do not want
8 fracking that will be encouraged by the pipeline. The
9 pipeline will damage the land, pollute the water and air
10 where we live. Do not force the pipeline on us so you can
11 financially benefit.

PS3A1-57 | 12 MS. RADER: My name is Joel Ann Rader, 320 Blue
13 Grass Trail, Newport, Virginia. The pipeline is going right
14 at the edge of our property. We've lived in the village of

PS3A1-57 | 15 Newport our entire life. We grew up there, we were married
16 in the Newport Mt. Olivet United Methodist Church, which is
17 a historic building that is being ignored by MVP that's
18 across our house.

PS3A1-57 | 19 We've watched many changes happen in this
20 village. This is the most appalling significant one to us,
21 what is happening right in front of us with the pipeline. I
22 ask myself every day if this is America, because I don't
23 think it was possible for money-grubbing land-stealing
24 individuals to show up and take what is not rightfully
25 theirs.

PS3A1-55 Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-56 The EIS concluded that the project would not have significant impacts on most environmental resources. See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. Sinkholes and caves are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS3A1-57 See the response to comment IND133-1 regarding the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church. The pipeline would be about 430 feet away from the church and should not affect it. Mountain Valley does not want to take any property. The would like to pay money for easements through negotiated agreements with landowners.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 26

PS3A1-58 | 1 This pipeline is for personal gain, not for
2 public use. We will not benefit from the pipeline at all.
3 There have been many various routes of this proposed
4 pipeline, but the present one is 221 feet from my property

PS3A1-59 | 5 line. We live in a home built in 1909 with great historic
6 value meaning to us. Yet the home has been left off of all
7 of the charts and not listed in any of MVP's documents.
8 Conveniently they've listed our neighbors' house across from
9 us, but we're not on the map.

PS3A1-60 | 10 Probably because it should be protected by
11 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of
12 1966. Our home is listed with the National Register of
13 Historic Places within the Newport Historic District. We
14 have not had the first notification mailed to us concerning
15 any information to attend meetings and voice our opposition.
16 This'll be the first for us.

17 I called to request a copy of the DEIS report
18 myself. Our name is listed in that document one time for a
19 denial of consulting status. It's hard to argue that DEIS
20 because the information in it is so full of erroneous facts.
21 One example they stated is the route is following the route
22 of the existing powerline. We live a mile from the existing
23 powerline.

PS3A1-61 | 24 We're greatly concerned about the construction of
25 the pipeline and what it will do to our property at home.

PS3A1-58 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See also the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. The Commission would decide about the public use of these projects.

PS3A1-59 If you reside in the Hardwick House (site #35-151-16) it is located about 365 feet away from the pipeline, and is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A1-60 The pipeline is outside of the boundaries of the Newport Historic District. You have not been contacted by Mountain Valley or received notices from the FERC because you are not an affected landowner. The FERC denied your request for consulting party status because you did not demonstrate a legal or economic relationship to the undertaking (as required by Part 800.2(c)(5)), and FERC's review process allows for the consideration of public concerns about cultural resources issues (in accordance with Part 800.2(d)). Alignment sheets illustrate powerlines in the vicinity of a portion of the pipeline route.

PS3A1-61 Mountain Valley did not request permission to survey your property because you are not located along the proposed pipeline route. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 There are underground springs and water all around our
2 house. Many of us and the surveyors and environmental
3 specialists could not figure out where all the waterflows
4 come from, so they have yet to ask permission to come on our
5 property.

PS3A1-62

6 Also of great concern is the fact that Dr. Ernst
7 Kastning, a karst expert, has called this route through the
8 entire Giles County a "no deal" zone and his report, which
9 is on file with FERC, seems to be ignored. We request that
10 FERC recommend the alternate route, Hybrid 1A. The
11 alternate route crosses a corridor already -- that's less
12 landowners, less miles of national forest, and does not
13 violate any historic districts. We invite FERC to come to
14 Newport and actually see where this pipeline is crossing and
15 what it's gonna do to our village.

PS3A1-62

See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report. Alternative 1-A Hybrid route is analyzed in section 3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-63

16 MR. WOLF: My name is Bill Wolf. I am here on
17 behalf of Preserve Craig, Inc., a non-profit environmental
18 organization based in Newcastle, Virginia. I am here to
19 state that, having closely read the draft Environmental
20 Impact Statement, I strongly request that the document be
21 withdrawn and redrafted.

PS3A1-63

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The EIS complies with NEPA. The final EIS is a revision that includes supplemental information and addresses comments on the draft.

22 I am requesting that because it is the opinion,
23 not only of myself, but numerous science experts and others,
24 that it does not comply with the National Environmental
25 Protection Act or the Council on Environmental Quality

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

28

1 Guidelines for producing environmental impact statements.

2 That's point number one.

PS3A1-64

3 Point number two is that it does not address
4 alternatives, or numerous issues that were submitted by
5 professionals who spent thousands of hours looking closely
6 at the data and provided accurate information about numerous
7 environmental historic district and cultural resource
8 issues, that were not adequately addressed or considered in
9 the DEIS. The primary source of information was inaccurate
10 and incomplete information provided by the applicant
11 Mountain Valley Pipeline.

12 Regarding the alternates, one of the alternates
13 that was originally considered actually avoids all primary
14 karst territories, all forest service land, and most
15 historic districts. And it's not even mentioned in the
16 DEIS, or even commented on as to why it was dropped, other
17 than internally an appear --

18 [band playing in background] I kind of object to
19 the room and the background noise, and the fact that there's
20 music in the background.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I have no idea. Let's stop for a
22 second. So we do apologize -- that's something the hotel --

23 MR. WOLF: I understand. Okay, so I was
24 concerned because as I said, the DEIS does not comply with
25 NEPA or CEQ guidelines and does not address numerous

PS3A1-64

Alternatives are addressed in section 3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 documents that were submitted, and information -- over 23
2 different science papers that were submitted that I'm
3 familiar with, including papers about karst -- endangered --
4 I've lost my train of thought from the interruption. I'm
5 sorry.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Don't feel rushed.

PS3A1-65

7 MR. WOLF: -- information on invasive species, on
8 sedimentation, and the special conditions of the deep, the
9 40 to 80% slopes that are being addressed. And the fact is
10 that these slopes are much more dangerous and much steeper
11 than what MVP even reports in their documents.

12 So finally, the Chair of the Science Committee
13 will be submitting additional comments at -- they're
14 probably in an adjoining room right now -- along with a
15 written paper on it. We will provide additional information

PS3A1-66

16 as well. But we believe that the correct thing to do for
17 the best interest of the public and the FERC is to withdraw
18 this document and redraft it because it does not -- it
19 doesn't even consider most of the public comments that were
20 made, but rather considers and is based upon the information
21 provided by the applicant.

PS3A1-67

22 Finally, I will comment on the new FERC process,
23 and that is that I believe the public hearings deserve for
24 the public to hear the public comments, and do not feel
25 comfortable that this is a procedure that meets the

PS3A1-65

Invasive species are discussed in section 4.4 of the EIS; slopes in section 4.1.

PS3A1-66

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS and stakeholder comments.

PS3A1-67

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. There are no federal laws or regulations that specify the type of public sessions to be held. The CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA specify in Part 1503 that after preparing a draft EIS the agency should request comments from the public. We did that in our Notice of Availability for the draft EIS issued September 16, 2016. Comments on the draft EIS can be in writing. There is no requirement to hold public sessions; although the FERC still does so to hear verbal comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-67
cont'd

1 requirements' intentions of federal laws regarding public
2 commenting process.

3 I do have a petition that is being circulated
4 that I believe would be -- I'd like to turn in at this time
5 -- specifically requesting that the DEIS be withdrawn.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Does this cover most of the points
7 that you spoke about?

8 MR. WOLF: Some of them, yes.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: If you want to file additional
10 written comments, because of the background noise --

11 MR. WOLF: We will do so.

12 MS. OSBORNE: My name is Suzanne Osborne. My
13 property is not involved. My comments are that I do not
14 feel that there's any economic benefits to our region,
15 primarily because this is a very specialized business and
16 most of the workers who would be involved will be transient.

17 The Department of Energy in 2015 says that we
18 have adequate capacity with gas and with some modifications,
19 what we have would last until 2030. Your agency, FERC,
20 requires a "public need". If the definition of need is the
21 number of contracts that the pipeline has in hand to warrant
22 or to justify building it.

23 I'm also concerned about the methane from the
24 compressor stations which are gonna take up 10 acres. This
25 gas, methane, is much more dangerous to the environment and

PS3A1-68 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment IND191-3 regarding local jobs.

PS3A1-69 See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding need.

PS3A1-70 Emissions are addressed in section 4.11 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-70
cont'd

1 to one's health than the carbon dioxide from coal.

PS3A1-71

2 As a financial analyst, the gas could go--almost
3 likely will go to oversea buyers--since nothing prevents
4 Mountain Valley Pipeline from selling this to other
5 contractors or other distributors who then can sell to
6 overseas. Hence, the value of this proposition to the
7 United States and to the area, our area, is very
8 questionable.

PS3A1-72

9 The widening of the corridor to 500 feet is very
10 concerning to me on the environment and the impact that this
11 will have, and whether or not there will be other pipelines
12 laid adjacent to, or alongside, along this huge swath of
13 land. You may remember, if you're old enough, there was an
14 ad with an Indian with a tear in his eye, and he looked upon
15 the landscape around him, it made him sad to see what we
16 were doing to the sacred landscapes that we should be
17 protecting.

18 As much as possible, we should keep the ravaging
19 of our land from economic impact, environmental impact,
20 especially when it's just for profits. The recent explosion
21 of the Columbia gas pipe line, which I realize is a
22 different kind of gas, but is an example of how horribly
23 things could go wrong if gas, i.e., natural gas, were the
24 only source for providing us with heat and lights, etcetera,
25 than a pipeline might be more of a necessity. But it isn't

PS3A1-71

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-72

See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility easement on the Jefferson National Forest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 32

1 in this case. And it isn't worth taking such brave risks
2 for the profit to investors.

3 It's almost unconscionable and I look to FERC and
4 the Department of Energy. You're charged to protect us and
5 our interests and the land. And I hope you should be, and
6 will be vigilant in your responsibility to protect us and do
7 the right thing.

8 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Mode Johnson. I am a
9 landowner, pipeline is on my property, Milepost 223.0, plus
10 or minus. My main points are the DEIS is not current or
11 correct concerning the Mount Tabor Variation proposed route
12 parcels. Also, DEIS comment deadline should be extended
13 since new information was recently released to the public to
14 comment on, and it should be extended whenever new
15 information is released.

16 MVP and FERC should evaluate the DCR Slusser's
17 Chapel Conservation Site Avoidance Concept Route. The Mount
18 Tabor Variation proposed route should also be re-evaluated.

19 An abandonment plan needs to be the financial responsibility
20 of MVP and EQT or successor companies and be funded in some
21 way in case of failure of any of the involved companies.

22 Now, back to the deadline for the DEIS to be
23 released or extended. It was released on September 16th and
24 it should be extended due to new information--you could call
25 'em data dumps--of over 1,000 pages released on October 27th

PS3A1-73 Since the issuance of the draft EIS, Mountain Valley has adopted the Mount Tabor Variation into its proposed route. This is analyzed in the final EIS.

PS3A1-74 In October 2016, Mountain Valley filed minor route modifications. New landowners along those modifications were provided with an extended period to comment up to February 21, 2017.

PS3A1-75 Section 3 of the final EIS includes our evaluation of the VADCR's proposed alternative to avoid the Slussers Chapel Cave Conservation Site.

PS3A1-76 Potential abandonment of the proposed facilities is discussed in 2.7 of the EIS. Any abandonment, modification, or re-purposing of the proposed facilities would require an environmental review and authorization from the FERC.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-77

1 and 248 pages on October 20th. The Mount Tabor Variation
2 proposed route has not been completely surveyed. At least
3 six major parcels, including two that I am a co-owner on
4 have not been surveyed completely before it was named a
5 proposed route after the DEIS was released and they still
6 have not been surveyed.

7 The Mount Tabor Variation route is no better than
8 the 2015 proposed route. Both are bad. According to the
9 Table 3.5.1-7, an MVP submittal released on October 16th,
10 the Mount Tabor Variation has:

- 11 1. More side slopes crossed, 2. More steep slope
12 crossed, 3. More shallow rockbed crossed, 4. More forested
13 land crossed, 5. More interior forestland crossed, 6. More
14 forested land affected, 7. More forested land disturbed
15 within the construction right-of-way, 8. More miles of
16 landslide potential, 9. More forested land affected during
17 operation, 10. More length of wetlands that was slated
18 affected in the report, and 11. More Pony Hill streams
19 crossed, four versus the 2015 route.

PS3A1-78

20 There's no reason the Mount Tabor Variation
21 should be the preferred MVP route in Montgomery County. The
22 Department of Conservation and Recreation, DCR Route, called
23 the Slusser's Chapel Conservation Site Concept, Submittal
24 Number 20160909-5315, should be seriously considered,
25 surveyed and evaluated.

PS3A1-77

The analysis of the Mount Tabor Variation has been updated in the final EIS.

PS3A1-78

Section 3 of the final EIS includes our evaluation of the VADCR's proposed alternative to avoid the Slussers Chapel Cave Conservation Site.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-78
cont'd

1 The DCR Avoidance Concept Route will avoid the
2 sensitive karst, caves and sinkholes of the 2015 and 2016
3 preferred routes that could be affected if a pipeline
4 incident, can seriously contaminate well water, agricultural
5 water, streams. The DCR concept also has fewer
6 owner-occupied parcels.

PS3A1-79

7 There must be an EQT/MVP-funded abandonment plan
8 for the MVP pipeline. A 42" high pressure natural gas
9 pipeline in the ground for forty to seventy years, there is
10 no funding for the abandonment. A metal pipe, a fossil fuel
11 will be 100 percent fail.

12 MS. VALENZUELA: My name is Aimee Valenzuela.
13 The land [sic] does not cross my property. I'm a Roanoke
14 County resident. So I'm just going to go through the
15 sections here that I've analyzed from the DEIS.

PS3A1-80

16 Section 4.9.1.6, there's only one recent study
17 cited for the impact of gas lines on property values. Other
18 studies range from 23 years ago. These studies are not
19 applicable to the current situation. More analysis is
20 needed.

PS3A1-81

21 Section 4.9.1.8 states that the pipeline will
22 cross several communities designated as environmental
23 justice communities due to high poverty rates.
24 Additionally, residents over the age of 65 or over --
25 represented across the proposed pipeline area. How these

PS3A1-79 Potential abandonment of the proposed facilities is discussed in 2.7 of the EIS. Any abandonment, modification, or re-purposing of the proposed facilities would require an environmental review and authorization from the FERC.

PS3A1-80 FERC staff reviewed relevant and available studies regarding impacts on property values from natural gas pipelines.

PS3A1-81 Environmental justice impacts are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		35
PS3A1-81 cont'd	1 populations will become economically affected was not 2 addressed in the DEIS. 3 Furthermore, the DEIS states that the workforce, 4 non-local workforce will result in a 21% demand in housing. 5 This report looks at total housing units, but the 6 availability of low-income housing units. A complete 7 analysis needs to be done on how environmental justice 8 communities will be affected.	
PS3A1-82	9 Section 4.9.2.1 states that the effects of 10 permanent employees is negligible and will not affect 11 unemployment rates in the pipeline region. This is in 12 direct opposition to posted statements to local residents. 13 This needs to be addressed.	
PS3A1-83	14 Section 4.9.2.3 states that there will be an 15 increase in demand for police, fire and EMS services. This 16 demand is not enumerated and could put a strain on resource 17 constrained communities. This needs to be addressed.	
PS3A1-84	18 Furthermore, that section states that a case can 19 be made, that there will be economic benefits of employment 20 in dollar expenditures during construction. This is in 21 direct opposition to the statement regarding employment in 22 4.9.2.1 and this case has not been made. The net economic 23 benefits to the community needs to be addressed.	
PS3A1-85	24 Section 4.9.2.5 states that there will be an 25 increase to surface damage of roads used by applicants.	

PS3A1-82 As stated in section 4.9.2.1 of the EIS, the estimated 25 new permanent employees would likely be negligible in regard to population levels within the counties crossed by the MVP (totally about 23 million people). Twenty-five permanent employees would represent about 0.0001 percent.

PS3A1-83 Emergency services are highly dependent on conditions at the time of work (e.g., employee specific, environmental conditions, weather conditions, etc.) such that an estimate is not possible. However, Mountain Valley has committed to providing financial assistance to regional first responders, and the payment of local taxes would further support community services.

PS3A1-84 Economic benefits from the projects are discussed in section 4.9.

PS3A1-85 While section 4.9.2.5 of the EIS states that there could be an increase in surface damage to roads, the next paragraph states that during construction, Mountain Valley would inspect roads periodically and, if damages occur as a direct result of project-related activities, would repair them as appropriate and in accordance with the applicable permit.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 36

PS3A1-85 cont'd
1 This has not been enumerated. What is the cost? And what
2 is the economic cost to businesses along the public roads
3 being used for construction? This needs to be addressed.

PS3A1-86
4 Section 4.9.2.6 states that the easements
5 agreements can include indemnification language, but does
6 not state whether this language is included. This needs
7 clarification.
8 Additional, as stated, the pipeline right-of-way
9 crosses known environmental justice communities. These
10 communities cannot afford lawyers to respond to easement
11 agreements. Construction should not move forward until this
12 is addressed.

PS3A1-87
13 Section 4.9.2.7 states that tax revenue is over
14 \$30 million. However, net revenue is not addressed. This
15 analysis needs to be done.

PS3A1-88
16 Section 4.13.2 states the following impacts:
17 Increase of growth in non-native invasive species,
18 Habitat-enforced destruction, Emissions, yet none of the
19 economic impact of cleanup or impact of tourism has been
20 addressed. Construction should not move forward until this
21 is addressed.

PS3A1-89
22 Section 4.12.2 cites a study from 1986 for safety
23 concerns. This is not recent. From 1994 to 2013 there's
24 been --
25 MR. MORRISON: My name is Martin Morrison. I own

PS3A1-86 Easement negotiations are between the applicants and the landowner.

PS3A1-87 Section 4.9.2.3 states that community services would be supported by additional tax revenues generated by the project as depicted in table 4.9.2-3.

PS3A1-88 Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-89 The 1986 study was not a discussion of the number of incidents. The 1986 study presents a comparison of incidents to the presence or absence of cathodic protection. The number of incidents using actual data from PHMSA was presented in section 4.12.2 using data from 1996 through 2015.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-90 | 1 property on an access road, which is MVP-MN-277.02. My
2 objections are this access road was put on the Docket
3 October 13th. I've not had the same opportunity to respond
4 that other people have had in the same timeframe. The
5 intervenor, I believe, was a short period early on where you
6 could intervene and I believe that period has passed.

PS3A1-91 | 7 And the draft environmental study? They haven't
8 even come down and surveyed our road yet. So how can you
9 submit a draft study when nothing has been finalized on this
10 property? When you drive down the gravel road, you go past
11 the interstate maintenance sign and then you start on my
12 land. This is a little, narrow gravel road, 12, 14 feet
13 wide. They proposed to expand it to 40 feet wide
14 temporarily, and then back to 25 feet.

15 I've got a mobile home where I've got a single
16 mom and her two kids living, and then there's another older
17 lady that lives down this road, and both of their houses are
18 within 30 feet of the center line of this road. And it's
19 not, they're both on the same side, but it has the road has
20 it split between 'em.

PS3A1-92 | 21 I've also got a pond down there across from the
22 older lady, and they're showing filling in part of my pond.
23 I didn't buy this land with this pond on it for somebody to
24 come along later and fill it in so that I can't fish, okay?
25 I planned on building a house on this land. I did not

PS3A1-90 As stated in section 1.4 of the EIS, the comment period to respond to the NOA (and the timeframe for requests for intervention) closed on November 27, 2015. Non-environmental Commission staff will make a determination on whether to grant a party's out-of-time intervention request. See the response to comment LA3-1 regarding the comment period for the draft EIS.

PS3A1-91 Not all parcels will be surveyed prior to issuance of an EIS. Some landowners do not grant survey permission.

PS3A1-92 Section 3.5 of the final EIS was revised to address these landowner concerns.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 38

1 intend for a semi-public group there to be happening on this
2 road. I believe that's my comments.

PS3A1-93 3 MS. HUMPHREY: My name is Pamela Humphrey. I'm
4 from Newport. The pipeline does not, as it's written right
5 now, cross my land. It did. Right now it doesn't. First,
6 this should be very embarrassing to FERC. Are they really

PS3A1-94 7 so afraid of us that they must speak to us in isolation? So
8 others can't learn from the data we've been forced to
9 collect?

PS3A1-95 10 Equitrans and Nextera obviously aren't convinced
11 that they can build and operate this pipeline safely. If
12 they thought they could, they wouldn't have felt it
13 necessary to hide the liability under three--yeah,
14 three--LLCs.

PS3A1-96 15 So who do I sue when erosion takes out the sides
16 of my valley? Who do I sue when my spring and well fail due
17 to diversion of the established underground channels caused
18 by your pipeline construction? Or when my spring and my
19 well are contaminated with silt from the erosion mentioned
20 above? And who does my lawyer daughter sue when slope
21 slippage or an earthquake along our documented fault line
22 compromises the pipeline and gases release and asphyxiate me
23 and my livestock? Or incinerate us?

24 Who do I sue when the Marcellus Shale deposit
25 runs out in 20 years? And we're stuck with a sure to rust

PS3A1-93 Section 3 of the EIS discussed route considerations. In October 2016 Mountain Valley filed minor route modifications. This is part of the environmental review process, since some of the modifications were in response to FERC recommendations in the draft EIS. The currently proposed route is analyzed in the final EIS.

PS3A1-94 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions.

PS3A1-95 Safety is addressed in section 4.12 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility.

PS3A1-96 See the response to comment 70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Earthquakes and steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Only intervenors would have standing to challenge a Commission decision.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-96
cont'd | 1 away 42" pipe, leaving a trench across our properties and
| 2 our landscape. This pipeline should not be built, but if it
| 3 must be built, it should follow the route that would do the
| 4 least damage to people, places and the environment.

PS3A1-97 | 5 We pointed out Hybrid Alternative 1A as the
| 6 logical alternative to Route 200. Hybrid Alternate 1A would
| 7 not go through eight historic districts. It would go
| 8 through only half as much of our precious national forest.
| 9 It would avoid the most extreme karst topography and it
| 10 would impact significantly fewer properties.

PS3A1-98 | 11 We are not professionals and this isn't our job,
| 12 but we managed to figure this out. If we can, why can't
| 13 FERC? Their lack of due diligence is showing. My property
| 14 appraisal dropped by \$18,000 because of this proposed
| 15 pipeline. That's a quote. Because of this proposed
| 16 pipeline. I retired here, drawn by the beauty and the
| 17 abundant water, both of which FERC is willing to subvert.

PS3A1-99 | 18 Living with a bomb capable of blowing up
| 19 everything within 1,500 feet is not acceptable to me. And
| 20 having to pay taxes on the land with the bomb under it, so
| 21 someone else can feed their stock profile is really over the
| 22 top. FERC is supposed to be nonbiased. Start being it. Be
| 23 what you're supposed to be. Examine and weigh data provided
| 24 by private sources, as well as that provided by the industry
| 25 hats, or we will rub your nose in your bias. Band together

PS3A1-97 Section 3 of the EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative.

PS3A1-98 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS3A1-99 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 and stop this thing on the land in the courts.

2 MR. MURPHY: My name is Brian Murphy. The
3 current route does not cross my property. One of the
4 previous ones did, the 110. What I wanted to simply say
5 was, as a professional aquatic scientist, I'm extremely
6 disappointed in the level of professionalism, completeness,
7 analysis that is displayed in this.

8 And I'm a university professor and taught for 40
9 years in natural resource conservation and management.
10 Hundreds of students that I've worked with on natural
11 resource management projects. I've taught to write
12 scientifically. This falls so far short of any professional
13 criteria or legitimate analysis that if I worked for FERC or
14 MVP, I would be embarrassed for the public to look at this.

15 We sent students to work for FERC, and I've
16 talked to them, and I've told them the same thing. To draw
17 conclusions before all of the data are even in is
18 unconscionable. To have analyses done by, in one case,
19 professional engineers that were overturned by what a
20 retired English professor found as deficiencies in the way
21 they did their analysis on stream scour is beyond
22 embarrassing to any professional. I can't believe that that
23 kind of stuff makes its way through this process without
24 being caught, either at MVP level or certainly at the FERC
25 level, which is supposed to be providing oversight to what

PS3A1-100

PS3A1-101

PS3A1-100

Section 3 of the EIS discussed route considerations. In October 2016 Mountain Valley filed minor route modifications. This is part of the environmental review process, since some of the modifications were in response to FERC recommendations in the draft EIS. The currently proposed route is analyzed in the final EIS.

See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS3A1-101

While some information was still pending at the time of issuance of the draft EIS, the lack of this final information does not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on the projects potential impacts on a range of environmental resources, and measures that would avoid, reduce, or mitigate those impacts. The courts have held that final plans are not required at the NEPA stage. As stated in the EIS we asked Mountain Valley to provide a revised analysis due to data gaps, inconsistencies in the analysis in addition to a public comment regarding errors.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 41

1 MVP is submitting. That's it.

2 MR. WALKER: David Walker. And no, [the

3 pipeline] doesn't cross my property, but comes in very close

4 proximity. I'm here as a representative from Preserve Giles

5 County and the Newport Mt. Olivet United Methodist Church.

6 My statement is that the Kastning Report, which I have read

7 front to back. I've read your EIS statement, although I

8 can't say I've read all of it.

9 And from Mountain Valley Pipeline, I don't

10 understand how you can justify putting a dangerous pipeline

11 through the topography that is in the Giles County area,

12 given the slope, slippage, the fact that there's an

13 earthquake zone that runs in through there. And expect to

14 remediate everything and have everything done properly. I'd

15 also like to talk about the Synapse Report that states that

16 there's no need for existing future infrastructure in order

17 to deliver more and more fracked gas from the fields in the

18 Marcellus area.

19 That simple reversal of flow rates can be done to

20 achieve the same purpose and the part that upsets me the

21 most about MVP is the lies that they've spread about, just

22 about everything, and how they don't take into

23 consideration, they don't even put boots on the ground, as

24 far as the lives of the people that they're disrupting in

25 order just to line their pockets and their corporate

PS3A1-102

PS3A1-102

See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report. Steep slopes and earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-103

PS3A1-103

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. Non-environmental FERC staff may address the Synapse report in the Project Order.

PS3A1-104

PS3A1-104

In their applications to the FERC, Mountain Valley and Equitrans explained the purpose of their projects, and how they developed their proposed facilities. FERC staff, contractors, and cooperating agencies independently fact-checked data submitted by the Applicants.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

42

1 folders.

2 I'm disappointed in FERC that they just seem to
3 take everything as read that MVP submits to them, and they
4 give them so many do-overs, it's ridiculous, that if
5 something's out -- and a lot of the research and stuff that
6 we've done and submitted, they just quote it back to you, so
7 it's like we're doing their job, which it shouldn't have to
8 be. And if this was a credible university or whatever and
9 somebody was supplied the information that MVP supplied to
10 FERC or whatever, they wouldn't be getting do-overs, they
11 would've just had a big "F" mark slashed on their paper and
12 handed back to 'em and told 'em to repeat the class.

PS3A1-105

13 In summation, the Newport Mt. Olivet church is a
14 high consequence area. They have moved their area crossing
15 Route 42 in Giles County, further towards the church, which
16 puts it much closer than the 1,117 feet that I had measured
17 personally, just following the road. It is much closer now
18 to the church, and has moved further away from the school,
19 and I can only assume they did that because there's a
20 daycare center there and everybody loves kids.

21 So I just wanna let you know that I don't believe
22 in the process that you all are doing. I firmly believe
23 that you're a rubber-stamp organization, and there's not a
24 pipeline that you guys don't believe in and put in, and the
25 other thing that bothers me about MVP is apparently they're

PS3A1-105

See the response to comment IND133-1 regarding the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church. The church is 430 feet away from the pipeline. See also the response to comment IND196-5 regarding the FERC review process. FERC's mission is to carry out the mandates of the NGA.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

43

1 now in business to just building pipelines. That goes the
2 same for Atlantic Dominion and all the other ones, that they
3 just pass on the costs of building these pipelines. They
4 pass it on to the customers, and then if the profits tank
5 selling the gas domestically, then --

6 MS. MALHOTRA: Lauren Malhotra.

7 MR. GITTELMAN: Samuel Gittelman.

8 MS. MALHOTRA: Great. My comment pertains to a
9 couple of different sections of the EIS that refer to
10 changes in the forestry, changes in the wildlife habitats.
11 Section 4.4.2.2 states revegetation of cleared areas will be
12 considered successful when the cover and density of
13 vegetation within the right-of-way is similar to the
14 adjacent land.

15 And I think that is really important to notice
16 that it says "similar" and not the same. What it sounds
17 like it's is promoting is, like over 10.2 acres of forest
18 and wetland will be affected, and those regions of forest
19 and wetland, within the right-of-way even will never return
20 to their former state. They'll be replaced by herbaceous
21 and shrub wetland. And even those that will begin to be
22 revegetated, so soon as construction ends it'll take years
23 and years for them to reach the same level of forestation
24 that they had before.

25 And nowhere in these sections have I read that

PS3A1-106

PS3A1-106

As explained in section 4.3 of the EIS, forested wetlands within the permanent easement would be converted to herbaceous or shrub wetlands. Forest fragmentation is discussed in sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-106
cont'd

1 the transformation of the forested land will account for the
2 climate-caused changes that we here in Virginia are already
3 locked into. For tree species do effectively migrate, thus
4 for whole habitats to survive in the next few decades of
5 warming and precipitation change. They require
6 uninterrupted and contiguous forestland to move along. So
7 these segmented sections of forested wetlands surrounded by
8 areas of mere shrubs have lost a significant amount of
9 resilience and are made more vulnerable to the effects of
10 climate change.

PS3A1-107

11 I also wanna talk a little bit about just some
12 far-off unintended consequences that it may have. So as
13 property values drop because of the construction and the
14 easements and the risk of explosions, and as folks in the
15 community move away, which I'm sure you've already heard
16 plenty of people talk about, feeling like they have to be
PS3A1-108
17 forced out of their land, feeling that they have to move
18 their families in order to remain safe and have the standard
19 of living that they've had before.

20 So as people leave and as people have to sell
21 their property for lower amounts than they had originally
22 invested in, we're gonna see a lot of industry coming in to
23 take that property and I think that the development that is
24 gonna be caused by those falling property values and by the
25 new -- I don't really know what that industry would

PS3A1-107 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-108 The projects would not force families off their land.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

45

1 specifically look like, but for the most part, developments
2 like chemical treatment plants, developments like factories
3 or even just like Wal-Mart's, tend to have much greater
4 environmental impacts that, say, land owners who have their
5 house and they tend to their forested areas and maybe they
6 have a self-sustaining garden.

7 So I think there's a lot of environmental impacts
8 that aren't being accounted for simply because you can't
9 predict how many people are gonna leave because of this.

10 You can't predict how many communities are gonna be
11 destroyed by this. And I don't know what's gonna fill that
12 space. I don't know what's gonna fill that economic space
13 as people's life savings are flushed down the drain because
14 their property values are no longer even close to what they
15 were when they first bought them. What they're gonna leave
16 for their children.

17 MR. ALAMI: Ajmal Alami.

18 MS. DESMOND: My name's Mary Desmond.

19 MR. ALAMI: As far as I'm concerned, Equitrans
20 and both Nextera have not factored in any negative
21 externalities, within their proposals for this pipeline.
22 Any of the health risks that have been included such as
23 people receiving cancer from poison and contaminated water
24 at the fracking site, or stress leading to short lifespans
25 and other various illnesses.

PS3A1-109

PS3A1-109 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS3A1-110

PS3A1-110 The potential health effects regarding methane are discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-111 1 There is no way to factor these in within the
2 costs, there's no healthcare or medication factored in, as
3 to whether these people can afford it or not once they're
4 sickened by this pipeline. What about the loss of
5 livelihoods for farms as well? If there is an eruption, are
6 they going to be covered or not? Because Nextera and
7 Equitrans, both can be held liable in a lawsuit for this?

PS3A1-112 8 There's also temporary jobs as well. The people
9 building this are not gonna have livelihoods forever.
10 They're gonna be used for several months and then tossed
11 aside afterwards. And of course you go into ethical issues

PS3A1-113 12 as well. This energy's being sold overseas at a high price.

PS3A1-114 13 Not for Virginians, not for us. As a result, Virginians
14 that live here are gonna lose by having eminent domain cut
15 through their land, and they're not gonna see any of the
16 benefits whatsoever in receiving any of this energy at all.

17 MR. DONALD JONES: My name is Donald W. Jones.

18 MR. KRZYSTON: Joseph Krzyston.

PS3A1-115 19 MR. DONALD JONES: I have some concerns for FERC
20 dealing with the DEIS. There's been an omission on the
21 Adlai Jones property that Mountain Valley has been made
22 aware of, the whole farm, and also the trace road. The
23 trace road, the other day when I was up there, it had survey
24 markers all over it, and we feel like that trace road is a
25 historical piece of property. We feel like it's part of the

PS3A1-111 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility.

PS3A1-112 See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PS3A1-113 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-114 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefit. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS3A1-115 The historic Adlai Jones Farm is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The Adlai Jones house (recorded as site #35-412-10 within the Greater Newport Rural Historic District) is about 1,791 feet away from the pipeline. Mountain Valley's contractor has re-evaluated the road trace associated with Adlai Jones Farm as a non-significant feature, perhaps a modern tractor trail.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-115
cont'd

1 Cumberland Gap Trail, and was just omitted in the DEIS.

PS3A1-116

2 Secondly, we have a mountain spring on the
3 property that's got deeded water rights since 1881 to a farm
4 next to us, and two other properties also have deeded water
5 rights. This spring water is our concern -- that is they
6 have to go in there and start blasting on this lower
7 mountain ridge, put this, put this on the center line,
8 putting this pipe in, that it could disrupt that spring and
9 open up the cavities and the water will disappear.

10 Mountain Valley tells us they'll fix it. How do
11 you fix a geological water supply that's hundreds of years
12 old? It's never ran dry. How do you fix it? For me, it's
13 amazing that FERC is willing to risk what we have, clean
14 water, for the profits of a gas company.

PS3A1-117

15 And secondly, the karst terrain, which I know
16 FERC is familiar with, but I think a lot of it's been
17 ignored on their part. They're taking information that
18 Mountain Valley has provided, in my opinion. I've walked
19 the surveys with the geology surveyors and they say that
20 they needed to do more drilling and stuff like that -- to
21 really know before they put that pipeline in -- what's
22 there. And they can't do that by the Code of the State of
23 Virginia, be drilling on your property for a survey.

24 Secondly, Ernst Kastning Report kind of spells it
25 out, and it looked like it got ignored also in the DEIS, and

PS3A1-116

Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Mountain Valley stated that it would fix or replace any springs or wells impacted. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS3A1-117

Karst is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

48

PS3A1-117
cont'd

1 like I say, that's concerning to me because the safety of
2 the pipeline -- these pipelines fail. It might be 50 years
3 from now, 75 years from now. But they fail. All of 'em do.
4 It's a matter of when, where, where are you gonna be at when
5 it does? Are you gonna be at the mouth of that cave that
6 this injection of 1,400 psi gas has followed this karst
7 terrain to this cave opening? And you peel your sweater off
8 and the static electricity blows the whole five miles of
9 earth up?

10 That 1,400 psi injected into the ground in this
11 karst terrain is a dangerous situation. And I don't think
12 the public's aware of it. I don't think anybody's thought
13 of it.

14 MR. VIETMEIER: Rudy Vietmeier. And the pipeline
15 is not on my property. I'm a member of the Executive

PS3A1-118

16 Committee of the Sierra Roanoke group. I'm here today to
17 caution you against an overreliance on the EIS on the
18 grounds that an EIS is not what it purports to be. It is
19 not an objective analysis of the environmental impact of a
20 project.

21 I'm a California transplant and have been active
22 with the Sierra Club there for a number of years. And so
23 I've been down this road a number of times. And what I find
24 is the system is flawed. Roanoke Plains today said the
25 system is rigged. My criticism is a little softer than

PS3A1-118

We disagree. The EIS complies with NEPA. See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

49

1 that, so I'll just say it's flawed.

2 When the National Environmental Policy Act was
3 enacted, it was probably done with the intent of issuing an
4 objective environmental assessment, but it didn't turn out
5 that way.

6 We're reminded of Samuel Johnson's observation:
7 There are two things you don't wanna see made, one of them
8 is sausage, the other is law. The flaw arises when the
9 party opposing a project commissions a contract to carry out
10 the environmental assessment, and the developer is obliged
11 to shoulder the cost of the study. As such, the developer
12 owns the study.

13 The law only requires that report be made public.
14 It doesn't any specify any particular one. If an assessment
15 is made and is not favorable, the developer could just
16 commission another study until it finds one to its liking.
17 This paves the way for the developer to choose the
18 assessment that will be released to the public.

19 After that the necessity of issuing assessments
20 that are amenable to projects is not lost on the contractors
21 who want the work. So when we read an EIS, it will probably
22 be biased toward the project. If it wasn't, you wouldn't be
23 reading it. So I would urge caution on assessing an EIS.
24 This concludes my comments.

25 MR. WIGGINS: My name is John Wiggins and I'm a

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

50

1 senior at Roanoke College. I understand that the job of
2 FERC is to provide for the future of energy production in
3 the United States. I respect that job. I, like everyone
4 else, live in a society that consumes energy.

PS3A1-119

5 What I ask of FERC is to consider is to attempt
6 to provide for the current energy needs using the current
7 energy infrastructure. I strongly believe that the Mountain
8 Valley Pipeline is not necessary to accommodate current
9 energy consumption.

10 Another way to close the gap between energy
11 consumption and production is to decouple the utilities.
12 This separates energy consumption from profits. Customers
13 will pay a consistent rate for their utilities. This will
14 encourage utility companies to increase efficiency and
15 reduce energy consumption. Hopefully this will decrease the
16 need to expand the current energy infrastructure while still
17 paying the energy companies for providing a valuable
18 resource.

19 I hope FERC will consider using the current
20 energy infrastructure to provide for the current and future
21 energy needs. Also, if you have the opportunity, I would
22 suggest the individuals of FERC to hike and explore the
23 Appalachian Trail. The views are truly breathtaking this
24 time of year. Thank you for your time.

25 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Bob Johnson. I live on

PS3A1-119

Section 3 of the EIS provides an assessment of using existing pipeline systems to meet the objectives of the proposed projects. The Commission would decide if the projects are necessary.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 Bent Mountain. I'm an Environmental Committee and Preserve
2 Roanoke Bent Mountain member, and an intervenor with respect
3 to the project.

4 Today I'd like to focus on the section of the
5 Floyd County pipeline through Roanoke County, Virginia,
6 where traverse is poor in Bent Mountains and specifically
7 where Bottom Creek, its headwaters and tributaries are
8 located. The DEIS incorrectly concludes that impacts to
9 Bottom Creek and its headwaters are short-term and can be
10 minimized and/or avoided. It is imperative that the
11 following facts be reconsidered and the pipeline rerouted
12 accordingly. Many of my comments are in response to the
13 Environmental Analysis, Section 4 of the DEIS.

PS3A1-120

14 Number one, a segment of Bottom Creek is a Tier 3
15 stream and all of its headwater and tributaries are
16 designated as wild, natural trout streams, populated by
17 brook and rainbow trout. The DEIS does not indicate that.
18 Approximately 10% of all fish species native to Virginia are

PS3A1-121

19 found in the Bottom Creek watershed. Three rare species of
20 fish, the big-eyed jumprock, the riverweed darter and the
21 Roanoke darter, whose existence is well-documented in Bottom
22 Creek. If you wanna see the Tier 3 nomination package, it's
23 there. And they're not listed in the DEIS under known and
24 potentially sensitive species or elsewhere in the document.

25 Tier 3 Bottom Creek, which is exceptional

PS3A1-120

As stated in section 4.3.2 of the EIS, although the MVP pipeline route would cross Bottom Creek, it would not be at the impaired segment or the Tier III segment (the Tier III segment is over 3 miles downstream of the proposed crossing location).

PS3A1-121

Section 4.7 provides a discussion of species that inhabit the project area. The big-eyed jumprock, riverweed darter, and Roanoke darter are not found in the project area.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 environmental setting, exceptional recreational
2 opportunities and exceptional aquatic communities, is the
3 only Tier 3 water body downstream from the proposed 300-mile
4 pipeline. It is highly sensitive to chemical and
5 temperature pollution, turbidity and sedimentation, as are
6 all these headwaters and tributaries.

PS3A1-122

7 According to available maps and appendices, the
8 pipeline will cross Bottom Creek and/or its tributaries at
9 least 39 times, and will parallel these water bodies for
10 approximately three miles. The main body the DEIS fails to
11 recognize this or consider the consequences.

PS3A1-122

Section 4.3 of the EIS has been revised as appropriate. The EIS includes a list of all waterbodies crossed.

PS3A1-123

12 Further, in light of sensitivities, waters
13 paralleling them should be prohibited, as with the waters in
14 Jefferson National Forest. Bottom Creek is listed as an
15 impaired stream due to temperatures that exceeds damage to
16 trout streams. Although the proposed pipeline is not slated
17 to cross the impaired downstream segment, it must be assumed
18 that the upper regions are also impaired and until the
19 baseline data shows otherwise. No data is currently
20 available on the headwaters.

PS3A1-123

We disagree that the upper regions of Bottom Creek should be considered impaired until data proves otherwise.

PS3A1-124

21 Regardless, loss of stream bank cover and the
22 permanent removal of tree canopy and native vegetation along
23 the pipeline corridor would exacerbate the water temperature
24 impairment of Bottom Creek and presumably its headwaters in
25 perpetuity. This would be a violation of the

PS3A1-124

See the response to comment IND226-19 regarding the proposed construction method for Bottom Creek.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-124 cont'd
1 Anti-Degradation Policy, the Clean Water Acts, that's in
2 316A. Further, the combination of increased water
3 temperature, turbidity and sedimentation would disrupt trout
4 fisheries in these waters, diminishing stream usage, which
5 is also a violation of the Anti-Degradation Policy, the
6 Clean Water Act, and that cannot be allowed.

7 Poor Mountain is the highest one, the steepest
8 elevation is on the proposed pipeline corridor. Because of
9 the shallow metamorphic bedrock extending for over four
10 miles long in this part of the corridor, blasting will be
11 necessary in the slopes exceeding 60%.

12 MR. TERRY: Coles Terry. Yes, [the pipeline]
13 crosses my property. 8741 Poor Mountain Road, Bent

PS3A1-125
14 Mountain, Virginia 24059. I don't want it. It's gonna come
15 right through my backyard. I'm within 300 feet of it. I'm
16 a little concerned with the wetlands it crosses, the creeks
17 it has to cross. Just the fact that I've lived there for
18 most of my life, my kids are the sixth generation there.

PS3A1-126
19 It's not real easy to dig through that property.
20 They're gonna have to blast. I got well water. I'm not

PS3A1-127
21 real sure what their plan is if something contaminates my
22 well water, what I get to do for the rest of my life. Of

PS3A1-128
23 course, I understand that there might not be a chance for an
24 explosion, but if there is, I'm gone. But I heard today
25 that on some of the older pipelines you have to worry about

PS3A1-125 Wetlands and streams are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-126 See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS3A1-127 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-128 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

54

1 that. So when do I have to start worrying? What do they
2 consider old?

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: This pipeline is built to last 50
4 years.

5 MR. TERRY: Okay. But when do they considering
6 it too old?

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: At 50 years.

8 MR. TERRY: Great. I might make it. If I live a
9 good life. Just worried about how it's gonna impact
10 everything. My property, my brother's property, my
11 sister's, where the watershed for most of Roanoke Valley,
12 Salem area. We've got trout streams up there. There's
13 Class Tier, that flow into a Class 3? We should be -- I
14 think we're designated that, too.

15 They got a lot of areas to cross that are just --
16 I don't know how they're gonna do it. It concerns me. I
17 don't think they know how they're gonna do it. I was told
18 today that they're gonna protect any environmentally
19 potentially with silt vents. I've been working in
20 construction most of my life. I know exactly how good silt
21 vents work. I just don't like it. I don't think it's fair.
22 And I particularly don't like being bullied, which I feel
23 like I am being [bullied] by MVP and the surveyors and just
24 the whole thing.

25 MS. TERRY: The pipeline crosses my property, my

PS3A1-129

PS3A1-129

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-130

1 four siblings and my 92-year-old mother. My name's Grace
2 Terry. My three siblings, my mother and I all own parcels
3 of land that are located within the Coles-Terry Rural
4 Historic District, which is approved as of September 15th,
5 2016, by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources,
6 VDHR, as eligible for listing to the National Historic
7 Register.

8 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to
9 recognize the impacts of miles of pipeline path and multiple
10 permanent access roads and workspaces located within the
11 boundaries of the Coles-Terry RHD, Rural Historic District.
12 It is stated on Page 4-345 of the DEIS that the pipeline
13 crosses the Coles-Terry RHD; however, there is no other
14 information given. The proposal of this RHD was identified
15 and acknowledged by MVP in June, 2016, yet the DEIS has no
16 evaluation of the effects. Therefore, the DEIS is
17 inadequate in its evaluation of historic resources on Bent
18 Mountain in Roanoke, Virginia.

PS3A1-131

19 In addition to this submission, surveyors working
20 for the MVP entered my brother, John Coles Terry, III's,
21 property on October 10th, 2016, without his permission and
22 despite his attempt by certified mail to provide his phone
23 number, to request a date to be present for surveying.

24 The surveyors dug up artifacts from the property
25 that day and did it out of the sight of my family members,

PS3A1-130

The Coles-Terry Rural Historic District is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A1-131

The statements regarding Mountain Valley surveys are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-131
cont'd

1 including my brother's wife, who was present, and we had
2 objected to their entry to the property, which they
3 accomplished, not by coming up the driveway and knocking on
4 the door of my brother's home to identify themselves and
5 notify that they were gonna be digging holes in the back of
6 the cleared field, which is easily accessible by a dirt road
7 and very close visible from his house.

8 Instead, they parked multiple vehicles on Poor
9 Mountain Road, about half a mile down on Poor Mountain Road
10 from my brother's driveway and entered the property where
11 they had to cross the creek, climb a steep ridge through the
12 woods, descend through more woods and thick underbrush of an
13 overgrown orchard to reach the ruins of an old house.

14 We have wondered, how did they know the specific
15 location of where they were going since they were earlier --
16 they were entering coordinates on iPads -- if they had never
17 been on the property before? That is, how did -- if they'd
18 never been on the property legally and with proper notice?

19 We can prove the fact that surveyors have entered
20 our properties without permission because a neighbor videoed
21 them and there was survey flagging in April, 2014, when they
22 had four vehicles parked in the middle of my brother's field
23 that is half a mile up Poor Mountain Road across a private
24 wooden bridge and down a private gravel drive.

25 Since my brother's wife is present, we said that

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 the landowner had the right to take possession of the
2 artifacts. The artifacts were in bags with labels, which do
3 not have any information such as GPS coordinates on the
4 labels that identify the location where they were dug up.

PS3A1-132

5 They tried to take our private personal property.
6 And I would like to state my objection to FERC about this
7 incident and have it entered in the public record and
8 reported to VDHR and any other state and federal agency that
9 have regulatory oversight under NEPA, Section 106.

10 MVP should be held responsible for this blatant
11 violation of a landowner's property rights to retain
12 possession of their artifacts. Additionally, it should be
13 unacceptable for any entry by unidentified persons on a
14 property, but especially problematic for surveying crews to
15 enter a designated historic property for the disturbance and
16 removal of artifacts, when the landowner has requested to be
17 present.

PS3A1-133

18 MR. ADAMS: My name is Thomas Edwin Adams, III.
19 And the pipeline does not cross my property. First of all,
20 in looking at the Environmental Impact Statement, there are
21 many problems with it. The biggest problems stem from just
22 the fundamental nature of the physical setting up the
23 proposed pipeline going across really steep terrain, where
24 landslides are common, the threat against, proposed by the
25 streams, crossing them, are significant because the

PS3A1-132

This comment is in the FERC's public record. Artifacts removed during archaeological investigations are to be returned to landowners after study.

PS3A1-133

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The EIS provides a discussion of landslides and steep terrain in section 4.1 and waterbodies in section 4.3.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-134

1 potential for flooding, and with climate change and the
2 increased frequency and intensity of heavy rainfalls, the
3 probability of extreme floods are increasing.
4 A clear example is what happened this past summer
5 in West Virginia where over 30 people were killed. Very
6 significant flooding. I just wanna state that my background
7 is hydrometeorology, focusing on flood forecasting, which
8 I've done for over 25 years. I'm an international
9 consultant in flood forecasting, published a book on flood
10 forecasting, so my credentials are pretty good.

PS3A1-135

11 There's increased frequency of landslides because
12 of the really steep terrain and the heavy rainfall. The
13 impact on forest resources is significant. The viewshed
14 impacts are -- from a scenic point of view -- are
15 disastrous. The potential for spills and leakages into
16 karst underground water pathways is incredibly significant
17 because it is a heavily karst region, many sinkholes and
18 subterranean conduits.

PS3A1-136

19 The impact on sedimentation in streams is highly
20 significant. Every reason that you could think of that this
21 is a bad location for the pipeline exists. It's an
22 earthquake prone zone. There is an earthquake in Giles
23 County, a magnitude over 4, in the late 1960s. So it has
24 happened. There is obviously one in northern Virginia not
25 long ago.

PS3A1-134

A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in section 4.3.2 of the final EIS.

PS3A1-135

The EIS provides a discussion of landslides, steep terrain, and karst in section 4.1. See the response to comment CO14-3 regarding spills. See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. Visual resources are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the final EIS.

PS3A1-136

Earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-137

1 If those weren't enough, the impact on climate
2 change with the increased use of carbon-based fuels should
3 be reason enough not to do this. If anything, what we
4 should be doing, we should be scaling back on the use of
5 carbon-based fuels. So even going forward to do this, for
6 those reasons should be--by itself--enough reason to not do
7 this project.

8 We need to go to alternative sources of energy,
9 not continue to promote the use of carbon-based fuels at
10 this time.

11 MR. JAMES CHANDLER: James Chandler.

12 MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: Silvie Chandler.

13 MS. KATHY CHANDLER: Kathy Chandler.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Does the pipeline cross your
15 property?

16 MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: It does.

17 MR. JAMES CHANDLER: The address is 10890 Green
18 Hollow Drive, Bent Mountain.

PS3A1-138

19 MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: I feel threatened as a
20 young girl on my property. Surveyors have come to my
21 property several times and we have declined by overnight
22 mail. The trespassing signs or "no pipeline" signs states
23 that data or surveying on properties and coming on
24 properties will be a trespass. And this comes through my
25 yard and landowners are being taken advantage of.

PS3A1-137

Climate change is addressed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-138

The statements regarding Mountain Valley's surveys are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-139 | 1 The water will be contaminated if this pipeline
 | 2 leaks, and it will not only go into my water, it will
 | 3 contaminate half of Roanoke County. No matter what you read

PS3A1-140 | 4 about people saying it will get lots of jobs and things is
 | 5 not adequate. It won't get any jobs. Landowners wouldn't

PS3A1-141 | 6 get enough money if it did go through because there is no
 | 7 amount of money that will be sufficient.

PS3A1-142 | 8 People have been killed by pipelines and I don't
 | 9 wanna be one of them. And a question is that, why would
 | 10 obedient civilians listen to police and/or listen to police
 | 11 when they ask them to leave? And they don't say no. And I
 | 12 don't see why it's any different for surveyors to say no to
 | 13 police and police not do anything about it. Because police
 | 14 would do something about it if it was a civilian.

 | 15 MR. BENTLEY: My name is Michael Bentley. I have
 | 16 undeveloped property in Roanoke County and at this time,
 | 17 it's not scheduled to cross my land. I have a Bachelor's
 | 18 degree in biology and studied geology extensively, as well
 | 19 as climatology in preparing for my Doctoral program, and I
 | 20 do have my Doctorate. I have followed this issue closely.

 | 21 I have examined the draft Environmental Impact
 | 22 Statement and as a scientist myself, I'm not feeling that
 | 23 the draft impact statement for this project is adequate. I
 | 24 think that some of the analysis is flawed. To my knowledge,
 | 25 no 42" high-pressure natural gas pipeline has ever been

PS3A1-139 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-140 See the response to comment IND191-3 regarding local jobs and
comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PS3A1-141 The statement regarding compensation is noted.

PS3A1-142 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 constructed over mountainous terrain with the karst
2 topography such as we have in southwestern Virginia and in
3 parts of West Virginia where this pipeline is to cross.

PS3A1-143

4 I believe that from what I have studied about
5 this situation, the Mountain Valley Pipeline will cross in
6 the vicinity of 1,000 streams and wetlands in Virginia and
7 West Virginia and I don't think there's any precedent for
8 proposing a pipeline that has such steep slopes of ascent
9 and descent at angles ranging--from what I understand--from
10 40 to 80%. Engineers typically limit slopes of roads and
11 other infrastructures, such as pipelines, to less than 15%
12 slope.

13 Constructing a corridor for Mountain Valley
14 Pipeline at such angles is bound to result in a great deal
15 of erosion on the mountain slopes and waterway
16 sedimentation. As a resident of the Roanoke Valley, I fear
17 the polluting effects of sedimentation on Carvins Cove, the
18 City of Roanoke water reserve.

19 As a user of the Jefferson and Washington
20 National Forests, this frequent hiker, I go to Pandapas
21 Pond. I got to Newport. I spelunk in the caves in Newport.

PS3A1-144

22 I am aware that all karst topography is connected as a flow
23 way of streams. They're not individual features that are
24 isolated. I don't think that that is adequately addressed
25 in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. From what I

PS3A1-143

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch pipelines in karst terrain. Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-144

Karst terrain is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-145 | 1 have read in there, they talk about avoiding this cave or
2 that sinkhole, but without any awareness that these things
3 are connected underground, much of which is not visible to
4 people.

5 We have a lot of people living in rural areas. I
6 own 18 acres of undeveloped Roanoke County land that the
7 pipeline right now is not scheduled to cross. I fear that
8 it might be rerouted and I want you to know that as a
9 scientist, I am not happy with the impact statement as it's
10 done so far, and I think it needs to be rejected, and I hope
11 FERC opposes the construction of this pipeline in Virginia.

12 MS. KIRKBRIDE: My name is Kim Kirkbride, and the
13 pipeline crosses within a mile of my property, but does not
PS3A1-146 | 14 cross it. I just wanna note that I think that this format
15 is incredibly un-democratic and is kind of a sham to have
16 all these people waiting to just speak one-on-one to a
17 recorder.

PS3A1-147 | 18 But what I really wanna talk about is how I
19 think -- the impact that this would have, especially by
20 taking the Jefferson National Forest plan and amending it to
21 allow this pipeline to go through, which does not serve the
22 Forest Service, the land or the communities that live there,
23 that rely on that forest, is appalling.

24 Like I'm so surprised that you would actually go
25 back and amend a plan that was put in place to protect this

PS3A1-145 Groundwater and karst are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-146 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions.

PS3A1-147 The FS has worked with Mountain Valley to develop project design features, mitigation measures and monitoring procedures to minimize the impacts to the resources those standards were designed to protect. These mitigation measures and monitoring procedures are described in the POD.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-148 1 place and to protect the resources that this -- like my
2 county. I live in Giles County and we are the fastest
3 growing recreational county in Virginia. Tourism is our
4 industry and this is gonna cross the Appalachian Trail?
5 This is gonna be visible up to 20 miles from
6 here? And that is going to destroy our tourism economy and
7 I can't believe that you would actually go back and change
8 and amend an intact forest management plan so that it would
9 benefit a corporate project. Like that seems fundamentally
10 un-democratic to me.
11 And I so wonder what you're thinking right now,
12 and I wonder how you see this, and I wonder what you think
13 about at the end of the day and how you live with watching,
14 so far, 73 people come through here and probably most of
PS3A1-149 15 them tell you how this will ruin their property values. It
PS3A1-150 16 could ruin their wells. It is going to affect the economy
17 where they live and their county because it's gonna drive
18 tourism away. It's gonna drive new perspective landowners
PS3A1-151 19 away. It's already wrecking the real estate market where I
20 live. I just wanna understand. I mean I'm speaking to a
21 recorder. But you're a human being and you are in a
22 position -- you all are in a position to do something about
23 this, and I don't -- I just wanna know -- I wish you would
24 speak to me right now and let me know what it is that you
25 think about, and whether you think that all of this is

PS3A1-148 Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Visual resources are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS3A1-149 See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS3A1-150 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-151 Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 totally irrelevant and you're just gonna --

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Are you done with your comments?

3 MS. KIRKBRIDE: I can be, if you'd like to speak.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's up to you. Well, you have
5 very little time. You wanna wrap up or you wanna stop now?

6 MS. KIRKBRIDE: I think I've made myself clear.

7 MS. THOMAS: Stephanie Thomas. I'm within 0.3
8 miles of [the pipeline]. It doesn't cross me, but it's
9 close. I know what fossil fuel explosion feels like. I
10 spent years recovering from burns, no fault of my own. I
11 had eight major surgeries, two per year, and then quit, not
12 because I didn't need more, but because I could take no
13 more. Over 25% of my body was burned, but over 35% of my
14 body was scarred for skin grafts.

PS3A1-152

15 My property is in the burn zone. Why our lives
16 and quality of lives are less important than gas companies,
17 most especially since there's no public benefit, I need
18 someone to explain to me. Why is India, who wants

PS3A1-153

19 renewables but cannot afford them--but we offer them fracked
20 gas until they can get them--more important than us?

PS3A1-154

21 Why is it okay for the company to use the least
22 safe equipment because we are considered a rural area? Why
23 not insist the thickest pipe be used? If you lived next to
24 it, what would you require? Please do not make us wonder
25 every day and night of our lives, if they are over? Help us

PS3A1-152

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-153

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-154

The DOT regulations determine class pipeline thickness as described in section 4.12 of the EIS. Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 move from fossil fuels to renewables.

2 I believe that before you ask someone to do
3 something, you should experience what you are asking. Be
4 sure to visit a burn ward close to you. Know what you are
5 asking of others.

6 MR. RILEY: I'm Brent Riley in Roanoke County.
7 The pipeline does not cross my property. I think what's the
8 most important consideration here is energy policy. And how
9 we're moving into the future with energy and what kind of
10 people we wanna be. What kind of world we wanna have. You
11 go to the international conferences on climate, and you have
12 indigenous people from all over the world buying, chipping
13 in, sending tickets up there and saying, "we've got a

PS3A1-155

14 problem." Fossil fuel is not the solution. We need to
15 mature and evolve beyond fossil fuel.

PS3A1-155

Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-156

16 And the other point that I wanna make is what a
17 pipeline like this of this magnitude will do to the beauty
18 of Virginia? I think the forest service, if you ask them,
19 they will be able to tell you that the single-most common
20 value amongst the people in the State of Virginia is the
21 appreciation for our ridgelines and our mountaintops, our
22 viewsheds.

PS3A1-156

Visual resources are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

23 And so the impact of this project on our viewshed
24 for a relatively short period time, is not a trade-off that
25 we should be making. So rather than looking at where the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 pipeline's gonna go or where it's at, I'm saying the whole
2 concept needs to be rethought, and we need to mature as a
3 society and contend with the challenges that we face.

4 MR. BOHON: My name is Cletus Bohon. And I live
5 in the Elliston area of Montgomery County, at the foot of
6 Poor Mountain. The pipeline does cross my property. My
7 address is 6210 Yellow Finch Lane. My milepost is 238,
8 approximately.

PS3A1-157

9 My main concern is my water. I don't know how
10 you can guarantee not to mess up my water supply. And if
11 you can, what's gonna happen to it? How will you fix it?
12 The pipeline comes within 200 yards of my well. My well is
13 225 foot deep. The water's at 75 feet starting, and this
14 aquifer is connected many miles and supplies many people
15 with drinking water.

PS3A1-157

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-158

16 I feel that the karst in this region should not
17 be dug and blasted on. Dixie Caverns is two miles from my
18 home. There has to be other caverns and caves in this area,
19 but there still has been no geologic survey on or near my
20 property that I know of.

PS3A1-158

Karst terrain is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-159

21 They they're gonna cross the Roanoke River one
22 mile upstream from the pump station for the Spring Hollow
23 reservoirs, which hundreds of thousands of people rely on
24 for their drink water. I don't know why you would let them
25 destroy our land and our water that we worked so hard to pay

PS3A1-159

See the response to comment CO49-63 regarding the Spring Hollow reservoir.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 for and protect. And what about our children, our
2 grandchildren? Meaning ours, yours and mine? We're gonna
3 destroy the planet.

PS3A1-160 4 Then there's abandonment. If this pipeline does
5 go through, there's no procedure to remove this pipeline
6 with all the toxic sludge in there, just be left for the
7 landowner to deal with. I think a good thing for this \$3

PS3A1-161 8 billion being spent would be better on renewable energy. I
9 think that's where the future is going, the wind and the
10 solar energy. I think it would be money well-spent.

11 This country was founded by the people for the
12 people. Not big business. I feel like there's been a loss
13 of that. And that's sad. Please don't let this happen.

14 MR. SAVAGE: My name's Edward Savage. I'm a
15 property owner just downstream of Milepost 218 on the
16 proposed pipeline route along Craig Creek in Craig County.

PS3A1-162 17 I'd like to voice my opposition to the MVP pipeline for a
18 plethora of reasons, many of which this limited format won't
19 allow me to fully address, including wildlife habitat,
20 fragmentation, cultural heritage and sense-of-place issues,
21 the impact to economic development efforts centering on
22 quality of life and the outdoor recreation industry I have
23 been employed in for many years. The rights of communities
24 and states to determine their own economic future and the
25 egregious disregard for property rights of landowners long

PS3A1-160 Potential abandonment of the proposed facilities is discussed in 2.7 of the EIS. Any abandonment, modification, or re-purposing of the proposed facilities would require a new amendment or separate application, an environmental review, and authorization from the FERC.

PS3A1-161 Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-162 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment session format. The EIS provides a discussion of wildlife in section 4.5, forest fragmentation in section 4.4, cultural resources in section 4.10, socioeconomics in section 4.9, and recreation in section 4.8.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 the pipeline route for a project with no proven public
2 benefit.

3 All of those are legitimate concerns not
4 sufficiently addressed in the draft Environmental Impact
5 Statement, but they pale in comparison to the primacy of
6 water. Beginning with the construction process, but
7 certainly not limited to the sedimentation that will
8 inevitably result from denuded slopes is unacceptable.

PS3A1-163

9 The challenges of constructing a 42" pipeline on
10 such steep terrain and especially among karst geologic
11 features is completely unprecedented. I rely on a spring on
12 the side of Peters Mountain for my water, my livelihood and
13 my very life. The threat to that invaluable resource is one

PS3A1-164

14 that I don't take lightly. The DEIS gives no confidence
15 that the pipeline's integrity will survive flood events,
16 earthquakes or even increased erosion which the pipeline
17 will inevitably cause.

18 I'm not alone in this concern as the pipeline is
19 proposed to cross more than 1,000 streams, many of them
20 vital first order headwater streams. In the event of a
21 rupture, which many qualified geologists and hydrologists
22 view as inevitability, our priceless water with which this
23 region has been blessed, which is increasingly important in
24 the era of a changing climate, will be forever defiled and
25 MVP will file bankruptcy, leaving me and my neighbors to

PS3A1-163

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipelines in karst terrain.

PS3A1-164

Earthquakes are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in the final EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 clean up the mess, if we can even survive in such an
2 environment without our most precious resource.

3 I came to this issue with an open mind. I looked
4 for the benefits, that it might serve our community. I'm in
5 no way radical. It's very clear that any supposed benefit
6 of this project is far outweighed by the true cost of
7 landowners and communities along the pipeline route, which
8 were not addressed in the DEIS. The DEIS is severely,
9 severely deficient. Public benefit hasn't been remotely
10 shown to exist, let alone proven.

PS3A1-165

PS3A1-165

See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

11 This pipeline is not necessary. Existing
12 infrastructure would support forecasted natural gas capacity

PS3A1-166

PS3A1-166

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

13 well into the future. This process, in addition, is a
14 farce. This is not a public forum. The FERC has no
15 accountability and an inherent conflict of interest.
16 Although I recognize the utter impossibility of impartiality
17 or evidence-based policy from the FERC, I implore you to
18 please reject the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

PS3A1-167

PS3A1-167

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment session format.

19 MS. GRAY: My name is Nan Gray, and I'm in
20 Newport, but no, the pipeline does not cross my property.
21 It comes close enough that it would impact it. And I don't
22 have any compensation coming my way. This pipeline needs to
23 be stopped.

24 I'm going to tell you, the draft EIS is a joke.
25 Have you started that? The draft EIS does not have a lot of

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-168

1 information. In fact, I'm reviewing the geology and the
2 soils and the water quality and there is a whole lot of
3 information completely missing. Never even looked up.
4 These are water resources for Craig County, and these are
5 the water resources we developed in 1992, stopping the
6 American Electric Power Line that proposed to go through
7 Craig County.

8 All the people in Craig County came together. We
9 put our hands to our maps. These are original maps. I have
10 more. But I brought these to show you that I actually have
11 these maps. I photocopied them and reproduced them here,
12 which is part of my deposition. One of the big things is
13 Mountain Valley Pipeline has proposed to come through the
14 Craig/Giles/Montgomery County area.

PS3A1-169

15 I went out with my GPS equipment and mapped where
16 the sinkholes and the caves and the springs are, and then I
17 mapped that on a piece of paper and I have a large sinkhole,
18 which is the blue line and Mountain Valley Pipeline, which
19 is the red line, and clearly they have a nest, a cluster of
20 sinkholes and karst features that are not on the Mountain
21 Valley Pipeline DEIS.

22 It should've been included. I submitted this
23 stuff to the FERC a long time ago and it was not even
24 considered. We produce clean water where I live. I can
25 drink the water out of the ground. It's not polluted. I've

PS3A1-168

Geology is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS; soils in 4.2; and water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending water wells and springs.

PS3A1-169

Some areas are not mapped due to a landowner not granting survey permission. The commenter's data is noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 had the water tested. It's good.

PS3A1-170 2 FERC needs to have a water security zone, a
3 national water security "no-build" zone, where nothing gets
4 into that area to pollute the water. We all need water. We
PS3A1-171 5 need a national food security. Mountain Valley Pipeline has
6 proposed in its latest DEIS to destroy over 3,000 acres of
7 prime agricultural land.
8 We don't have 3,000 spare acres in Appalachia,
9 let alone 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land which will
10 be impacted and destroyed forevermore. I'm a soil
11 scientist. When you impact these soils with a construction
12 project like this, it doesn't matter if you put some toxin
13 in the pipes. The construction is gonna destroy your soils.
14 It will never be the same.

15 I wanna know how many times FERC looks through a
16 document and says, "There's a problem, there's a problem,
17 gee, we better just not approve this route." And so what my
18 question to you is, how many times do you have to be told
19 "no", that there's a danger before FERC says, "Let's look at
20 another route." Do you have an answer for me?

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll have an answer for you in the
22 final environmental protection --.

23 MS. GRAY: Well, I think that's really
24 short-sighted, that you're even considering coming to an
25 area that has clean water, which is in southwest Virginia.

PS3A1-170 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-171 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. As stated in section 4.2.2 of the EIS, the applicants would minimize impacts to prime farmlands by segregating topsoil, removing rock, and decompacting soils. We examined alternative routes in section 3.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 That pipeline never needs to go through West Virginia and it
2 doesn't need to --

3 MS. BELINSKY: My name is Tammy Belinsky. The
4 pipeline does not cross my property. It crosses within a
5 couple miles of my home.

PS3A1-172

6 The draft EIS is woefully incomplete and
7 inadequate to give the public information required under the
8 National Environmental Policy Act in order for the public to
9 comment on the impacts of the proposed action. It is
10 inadequate for other decision makers to make adequate
11 assessments of the impacts. There's not enough information
12 for the Forest Service to be able to make impacts.

PS3A1-173

13 There's been a lot of information submitted to
14 the record by individuals that show that the information
15 provided by the developer is incomplete. They routinely
16 leave out evidence of streams and springs and wetlands and
17 those types of features. And that's the issue here is the
18 impact to water, that this pipeline will cause.

PS3A1-174

19 It's an unprecedented proposal to cross these
20 mountains with its steep terrain, its unstable geology, the
21 soils that are present, which are very minimal, it's mostly
22 rock. You can't backfill a pipeline with rock. Where's the
23 soil gonna come from? What's gonna keep it staying there?
24 It's actually just flat-out ridiculous.

25 It defies logic to try to build a 42" gas

PS3A1-172

See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS3A1-173

Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-174

See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipelines in mountainous terrain. As stated in section 2.4.2, the first 12 inches at the bottom of the trench above the pipe would be clean fill, absent of rocks. Limestone dust may be brought in and used as padding material only when other local suitable fill is unavailable. The trench would then be backfilled using the excavated material; first with subsoil, then with topsoil.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

73

PS3A1-175

1 pipeline over these mountains. And so what's missing from
2 this Environmental Impact Statement is how can the impacts
3 to water resources and soils and geology and with the karst
4 topography, it can't be mitigated. There's evidence from
5 Professor Kastning that this can't be mitigated. And so how
6 can you -- and even where it can be mitigated, there's no
7 evidence -- or mitigation is proposed, there's no evidence
8 that mitigation can work in this geography and this geology
9 and this terrain.

10 It's a very short-sighted proposal, because we
11 will be sacrificing our own water security, our very own
12 water security for a very false sense of energy security.
13 To send energy, to send gas to Eastern Europe. To fuck with
14 Putin. We're gonna be sacrificing our own water. This is
15 about water. And water is life. Water is all there is.
16 Water is all we are, and water is all we have. Water is all
17 we have in this region, and where is my water gonna come
18 from when I can't get it anymore because of this gas
19 pipeline. It's ridiculous. You're a sham.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Ray Roberts. I'm from Blacksburg,
21 Virginia. My sister has a farm in Craig that the pipeline,
22 Route 110 and 110J crosses. So 110 and 110J have been
23 rejected, but I also talk for Newport, the town of Newport.
24 Newport is a historical town. It's one of the few towns in
25 the State of Virginia that have no government bodies to

PS3A1-175

The EIS provides a discussion of karst in section 4.1, soils in section 4.2, and water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 protect them. So there's actually no government body to
2 protect Newport per se. There's no town council, there's no
3 supervisory group that is coming to speak for them.

4 Newport is a very historical town. There are
5 only seven antique covered bridges in the State of Virginia,
6 and two of those are within a mile circle of Newport, and
7 very close to the pipeline routing. And you probably had a
8 chance to see the covered bridges we have. But there's two
9 of those sites. Newport has -- There are historical
10 structures that are 1820s.

11 I know the 1820s structures that are standing
12 that are threatened. There's a cultural center which is an
13 old school which is a cultural center right downtown Newport
14 that is kind of like a center, a community center for
15 Blacksburg and Newport, the whole group comes over there and
16 there's like sculptures, painters -- my sister is a portrait
17 artist. She goes in there and they sell portraits. Quilts.

18 And the pipeline is projected to go right through
19 the middle of Newport, take out the fire station and the
20 cultural center and then go over the next mountain towards
21 Blacksburg. So I'm very interested in hoping that this
22 won't happen, that you guys won't destroy the cultural
23 center in Newport, which has a historical background. There
24 are houses, the McWhorter's house is threatened, which is
25 right there in front of the cultural center.

PS3A1-176

PS3A1-176

Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The 1933 high school/Newport Recreation Center is 945 feet from the pipeline; the fire station 3,353 feet away; and McWhorter house 1,820 feet.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 So Newport has a history of earthquakes. It is
2 historically -- it's right in the middle of the karst
3 limestone. There's caves and there's mines in the area on
4 Brush Mountain on one side, and one of the largest
5 landslides in the history of the Appalachians happened in
6 Newport, so historically there was a gigantic landslide
7 there in the past, and it's documented in history at
8 Smithville Plantation back in the early 1800s.

9 So the chance of a landslide happening again is
10 very possible because in the last two years, I've seen two
11 earthquakes that shook Newport and cracked buildings. So
12 we've actually had activity that has actually structures --
13 and the same earthquake that actually shook and broke the
14 Washington Monument is the same earthquake that shook
15 Newport. I was standing there the day it happened.

PS3A1-177

16 So that is a very bad risk to run a pipeline
17 through that earthquake-prone zone. Just very interested --
18 there's historical Civil War sites all through the area. We
19 have Civil War monuments on our properties and properties
20 around Newport. There was a big Civil War battle. The
21 stones are usually just a single stone. I've got pictures
22 of the stones. And you can track 'em back. They say CSA on
23 'em.

PS3A1-178

24 They're Civil War monuments and those should be
25 protected. Native American sites are throughout the area.

PS3A1-177

Earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-178

Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 76

1 I just wanted to say there's so much history in our area.
2 Our area was settled in 1741, they came right through
3 Newport, they came right through my farm. We need to go
4 back and look at all this history and bring in the
5 archeologist and really look at what you guys are
6 threatening right now.

7 MR. VALENZUELA: James Valenzuela. I have the
8 following concerns regarding the draft of the EIS. Section
9 4.12.1 states that the minimum safety standards will be
10 implemented. However, there have been at least two pipeline
11 accidents since this report was released in Pennsylvania and
12 Alabama. The MVP is within 0.1 miles of two schools. Are
13 there new safety standards that should be implemented in
14 light of these accidents?

15 Additionally, the economic impact of these
16 accidents needs to be included in the report. How will the
17 school children be impacted by construction? Traffic?
18 Dust? Accidents, etcetera? Safety monitoring stats
19 included in the report are: Walking the pipeline. However,
20 there are 300 miles of pipeline across private land. How
21 will this be done?
22 Flyovers. How often will this be done? What is
23 the economic impact of the community and tourism areas
24 because of this? There will be an increase in demand for
25 police, fire and EMS services. The demand is not numerated

PS3A1-179 Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A1-180 As stated in section 4.12.1 of the EIS, the safety standards are mandated by the DOT not the FERC.

PS3A1-181 The EIS provides a discussion of traffic in section 4.9 and dust in section 4.11.1. If the pipeline is certificated, the applicant would reach easement agreements with all affected landowners, which would give them the ability to monitor and patrol the pipeline in accordance with DOT regulations.

PS3A1-182 Tourism is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-183 See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		77
PS3A1-183 cont'd	1 and could put strain on resource-constrained communities. 2 Further, the applicant states that resources will be made 3 available for these services, but that is not enumerated.	
PS3A1-184	4 Section 4.12.2 states that property damage 5 greater than \$100,000 can be reported by landowners. What 6 about damages less than \$100,000? This threshold is 7 insufficient to address the needs of environmental justice 8 areas.	PS3A1-184
PS3A1-185	9 The applicants used a study from 1996 to address 10 safety concerns. Studies from 30 years ago are not 11 sufficient to address today's safety issues. From 1994 to 12 2013 there have been 745 pipeline incidents causing death 13 and injury to persons. 278 deaths, 1,059 injuries, causing 14 \$110 million in property damage. There have been 26 15 accidents already in 2016, including 21 injuries. The 16 applicants have not adequately addressed their 17 responsibility in clean-up and recovery efforts and health 18 costs if there is an incident.	PS3A1-185
PS3A1-186	19 Additionally, the economic costs to impacted 20 areas was not analyzed. This needs to be addressed using 21 current studies. If none exist, then studies should be 22 conducted by the applicant to address the issue.	PS3A1-186
PS3A1-187	23 Section 4.13.2 states the following impacts: 24 2,902 acres of prime farmland will be disturbed. However, 25 this is inconsistent with numbers presented in Section	PS3A1-187

PS3A1-184 Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Section 4.12.2 provides an analysis of incidents that have resulted in more than \$100,000 in damage from 1996 through 2015. This is not a threshold for which a landowner could report damage or which a landowner would be compensated.

PS3A1-185 See the response to comment PS3A1-89 regarding the 1986 study.

PS3A1-186 Socioeconomics is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-187 Due to the October 2016 route changes, the prime farmland numbers have been revised in the final EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		78
PS3A1-187 cont'd	1 14.8.2.1. What are the correct numbers and what is the	
	2 economic impact on this loss? Emissions. What is the long	
PS3A1-188	3 term economic impact of health consequences due to increased	
	4 emissions, specifically for environmental justice	
	5 communities and populations greater than 65 years of age?	
	6 Section 5.1.3 states that the applicant would	
PS3A1-189	7 provide an alternate water source if groundwater is	
	8 impacted. What would this new source be? How would it be	
	9 distributed? What is the economic impact of this? What is	
	10 the tourism impact? And what is the impact on environmental	
	11 justice communities and populations over age 65?	
	12 I wish to voice a general concern about the	
PS3A1-190	13 destruction of forest on forest service lands. Development	
	14 since the draft of this report that I'd like to bring to	
	15 your attention. Roanoke was just voted top adventure town	
	16 by Blue Ridge Outdoors. A thorough analysis of future	
	17 tourism dollars versus dollar losses due to tourism needs to	
	18 be conducted.	
	19 A recent report in Roanoke Business News showed	
PS3A1-191	20 that outdoor investments lead to better health outcomes. A	
	21 thorough health and economic analysis of the gas line	
	22 impacts on health needs to be conducted.	
	23 And finally, the MVP is in fact not needed. The	
PS3A1-192	24 estimated completion date of the pipeline is 2020, and gas	
	25 production from the Marcellus extraction will be on the	

PS3A1-188 The potential health effects regarding methane are discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS. Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-189 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Tourism is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-190 See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forests. Tourism is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A1-191 The potential health effects regarding methane are discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PS3A1-192 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 decline at this time since it's estimated to peak in 2018.

2 Current pipelines are operating at 54%.

3 MR. CHANDLER: James Chandler. Yes, [the
4 pipeline does cross our property]. And we live at 10890
5 Green Hollow Drive on Bent Mountain.

6 The mountains are our water fountains and they
7 are imperiled. The pipeline cuts across Mill Creek on our
8 property with a 100 acres watershed, numerous springs and

PS3A1-193

9 wetlands on our property. Our well, our only water source,
10 is rock-throwing distance from the pipeline pathway. Damage
11 to the water source will--not only our water--but endanger
12 the water supply for Roanoke County and even Roanoke city.

PS3A1-193

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-194

13 Our property's torn in half by the pipeline path,
14 forever rendering half of it to be unusable and essentially
15 unbuildable. Our personal enjoyment and use of the land
16 will be forever lost to us and our children. The permanent
17 access road for the pipeline also happens to be the only
18 road to our driveway, knocking down a quarter mile of our
19 pasture fencing and permanently interfering with going to
20 work, school, church and even EMS access.

PS3A1-194

As stated in section 4.8.2.2, Mountain Valley would maintain access to homes and driveways. This would extend to emergency response services. The commenter's statements regarding Mountain Valley's surveyors are noted. See also the response to comment letter IND362.

21 Your surveyor tactics during this whole process
22 have been deceptive and threatening, coming on dates not
23 announced. We were out of town on vacation and asked that
24 they not come during that time, and come they did. And our
25 due process in court to resolve the conflict has been

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 cancelled by MVP.
2 This pipeline is bad for the environment, bad for
PS3A1-195 3 Roanoke County, bad for water quality, will destroy property
4 values, bad for the local economy and is not needed. Please
5 stop this before it's too late.

6 MR. REILLY: Ian Reilly. I am an affected
PS3A1-196 7 landowner, Milepost 262 . My concerns. Use of the forest
8 service lands as the utility corridor for this pipeline and
9 other potential pipelines, destroying the old-growth forest,
10 limiting recreation opportunities, disturbing wildlife, and
11 placing the burden on the backs of the rural citizens who
12 care about "live, lead and die" on these lands.

13 The dismissive nature of FERC officials and MVP
14 officials, either not answering, misdirecting or
15 disregarding the comments, research and questions raised by
16 concerned citizens that are dealing with the threat that
17 this pipeline, this destructive pipeline, brings with it.

PS3A1-197 18 Personally, the disregard of MVP personnel, ignoring our
19 biosecurity signs, endangering the lives of our livestock
20 and my livelihood and the ability for me to provide food for
21 my family and for other people, trespassing, and we're also
22 transitioning to organic, and a pipeline coming through,
23 that's a very specific environmental issue. Organic lands
24 with pipes with all the chemicals, herbicides and whatever
25 else is gonna be sprayed, causing issues.

PS3A1-195 The EIS provides a discussion of water resources in section 4.3 and socioeconomics in section 4.9. See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PS3A1-196 The EIS provides a discussion of impacts on NFS lands in section 4.8, wildlife in section 4.5, and recreation in section 4.8.

PS3A1-197 See the response to comment LA5-1 regarding stakeholder comments. The commentor's statements regarding Mountain Valley are noted. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides. In addition, organic farms are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-198 | 1 We have two creeks and a wetland area that would
2 be potentially crossed by this that are very sensitive
3 areas, banks, water for animals, as well as for recreation.
4 And for the record, one last thing, I think that Paul
5 Friedman's an asshole. Thank you.

PS3A1-199 | 6 MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Genesis Chapman. No,
7 [the pipeline] does not cross my property. It crosses the
8 property of almost all my neighbors, and it crosses the
9 property that my family's rented for their business for 25
10 years. They also -- I think they want to use the driveway
11 to my family's woodshop as an access road, which would
12 really screw up with our business, to say the least.

PS3A1-199 | 13 But I have lived on Bent Mountain all my life.
14 I'm very concerned with the quality of the environmental
15 report, the DEIS report, having known the creeks, the ridges
16 like the back of my hands since I was a kid, and then seeing
17 the proposed pathway, I'm shocked at the route it's taking,
18 much less actually coming over Bent Mountain, which is a
19 huge mountain. It's shale.

PS3A1-200 | 20 I haven't seen anything that really -- it's hard
21 to find any information about the creeks themselves. 39
22 creeks, tributaries to Bottom Creek, which is a Tier 3,
23 supposedly protected, creek. It filters all the water from
24 all the wetlands on the mountain and the springs into
25 Roanoke, into the Roanoke River.

PS3A1-198 Waterbodies and wetlands are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-199 The commentor's statements regarding an access road is noted.

PS3A1-200 All of the waterbodies that would be impacted by the projects are listed in appendix F. See the response to comment IND226-19. The statements regarding Mountain Valley's surveyors are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-198

1 We have two creeks and a wetland area that would
2 be potentially crossed by this that are very sensitive
3 areas, banks, water for animals, as well as for recreation.
4 And for the record, one last thing, I think that Paul
5 Friedman's an asshole. Thank you.

PS3A1-199

6 MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Genesis Chapman. No,
7 [the pipeline] does not cross my property. It crosses the
8 property of almost all my neighbors, and it crosses the
9 property that my family's rented for their business for 25
10 years. They also -- I think they want to use the driveway
11 to my family's woodshop as an access road, which would
12 really screw up with our business, to say the least.

PS3A1-200

13 But I have lived on Bent Mountain all my life.
14 I'm very concerned with the quality of the environmental
15 report, the DEIS report, having known the creeks, the ridges
16 like the back of my hands since I was a kid, and then seeing
17 the proposed pathway, I'm shocked at the route it's taking,
18 much less actually coming over Bent Mountain, which is a
19 huge mountain. It's shale.

20 I haven't seen anything that really -- it's hard
21 to find any information about the creeks themselves. 39
22 creeks, tributaries to Bottom Creek, which is a Tier 3,
23 supposedly protected, creek. It filters all the water from
24 all the wetlands on the mountain and the springs into
25 Roanoke, into the Roanoke River.

PS3A1-201

Alternative routes are discussed in section 3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

83

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: You know, we have maps in the next
2 room. You can find out exactly where it is.

3 MS. JAKE: Okay, on Thursday, December 16th,
4 2014, where QET and Nextera hosted a community open house at
5 the Days Inn Blacksburg to introduce, discuss and answer
6 questions regarding the proposed MPV pipeline. Mr. Friedman
7 told me and others that once a pipeline has been prefiled
8 with FERC, it is usually approved by the Commission. After
9 the final EIS is agreed and submitted to the Commission.

10 Mr. Friedman did not know of any case where the
11 Commission did not approve the building of the pipeline.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can I amend that now? I know of
13 one case, called the Pacific Connector.

14 MS. JAKE: Okay. My problem is that I feel an
15 impartial review is occurring. Very few of the mitigation
16 plans requested have been received. And then there is no
17 possibility for a no-action alternative under Section 3.1 in
18 the draft EIS. In fact, since the no-action alternative has
19 never been used, it appears that this is only a pretense
20 based on FERC FY17 Budget Request where Objective 2.1 is to
21 "foster economic and environmental benefits for the nation
22 through the approval of natural gas and hydropower
23 projects".

24 Furthermore, in the FERC FY17 Budget Request,
25 there is no need for funding to be appropriated from

PS3A1-202

PS3A1-202

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment IND196-5 regarding the FERC review process.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 Congress since FERC operates on a full-cost recovery, also
2 documented in the FERC FY17 Budget Request where "the
3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, or the
4 Commission recovers the full cost of its operations through
5 annual charges and filing fees assessed on industries it
6 regulates as authorized by the Federal Power Act and the
7 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986. The Commission
8 deposits this revenue into the treasury as directed offset
9 to its appropriation resulting in no net appropriation."

PS3A1-203

10 So my question is, why do we appear to follow the
11 NEPA process and not have a no-action alternative? My
12 answer is that the process is unfair and allows for
13 corporate greed to run our country. My suggestion is that
14 FERC makes the MVP their first no-action alternative. Thank
15 you.

16 MS. SHEA: Amy Shea. And no, the pipeline does
17 not currently cross my property. I'm a Virginia native. I
18 grew up on Wreck Island Creek in Appomattox County. Came to
19 Virginia Tech in 1988, lived in various places throughout
20 Virginia, but came back to southwest Virginia in '99 to
21 raise my family. My teenagers live here with me. We've
22 lived in Ironto on the bank of the north fork of the Roanoke
23 River for 14 years, which is the longest I have ever lived
24 anywhere. I love this area very much.

25 Water has always been very special to me. I've

PS3A1-203

The no-action alternative is discussed in section 3.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 always lived close to water and also I'm a Pagan, that's a
2 nature-centered religion and water is extra special to me.
3 I'll stick to that reason. As I was thinking about this
4 issue and why I feel so passionate about it, I realize that
5 to me one of the most outrageous parts is that water is one
6 of our fundamental needs, along with good food and clean
7 air.

8 We can't live without it. None of us can live
9 without it. It's the great equalizer. No amount of
10 material riches matter if our basic life needs aren't met.

PS3A1-204

11 And water is a basic right. It's absolutely ridiculous that
12 our water would be compromised this way.

PS3A1-204

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

13 And if you look at Maslow's hierarchy of needs,
14 our physiological needs are at the bottom, the next tier up

PS3A1-205

15 is safety, the other thing that the pipeline does is
16 threatens our safety on a daily basis. Seems like part of
17 our new reality is that pipelines are exploding, you know,
18 day to day, and that's just craziness. We don't know the
19 long-term effects of all this stuff, and we do know that our
20 water is being poisoned, and none of us can live without
21 that water.

PS3A1-205

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

22 There's a book called the The Water Knife by
23 Paolo Bacigalupi. Came out a couple years ago and it's a
24 post-apocalyptic book about water wars, and I believe that's
25 what we're about to come up to next in our world, in our

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 life. It's a horror tale, it's a nightmare horror tale, and
2 I feel like that is what we're getting ready to experience
3 with these pipelines crisscrossing our country, we need to
4 stop at this point in our evolution of the world, we should
5 be moving toward clean energy, supposedly the world has come
6 together and setting their goals by 2030, and instead of
7 investing in new infrastructure, we need to be looking
8 towards clean energy solutions. Water is life.

PS3A1-206

9 MR. DENNIS JONES: I'm Dennis Jones.
10 MR. LANDON JONES: Landon Jones.
11 MR. DENNIS JONES: Yeah, the pipeline is crossing
12 our property at Mile Marker 215. And it actually belongs to
13 my father, George Jones, but it's been in the family since
14 1775, that whole tract. There's a lot of historical
15 buildings there. There's a pole barns, barn that was built
16 in 1930, and like I said, there's other pole barns and sheds
17 that were built.

18 And we're just concerned -- there's a spring on
19 dad's property that feeds two houses there -- there's three
20 houses it feeds, and we're just concerned with the
21 contaminated water from the pipeline. The spring is within
22 probably 150 feet of the center line of the pipeline and
23 we're concerned about the contaminated water.

PS3A1-207

24 We're concerned about the report of Ernst
25 Kastnings. He's done a report and a lot of study on the

PS3A1-206

Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-207

Historic resources are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS, including the pole barn at the Adlai Jones Farm (site #35-412-10 within the Greater Newport Rural Historic District). See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-208 | 1 karst environment. Concerned about the sinkholes. Dad has
2 sinkholes on his property. We brought it to the attention
3 of Mountain Valley Pipeline and they appeared to ignore

PS3A1-209 | 4 that. They've ignored the historical buildings up until --
5 I think FERC maybe said something to 'em so they're -- I
6 don't know if they've recognized it yet or not, but -- but
7 anyway, we're just really concerned about the karst
8 environment and the contaminated water. Hope that they'll
9 take all that into consideration.

10 MR. MILLER: My name is Mark Miller. And the
11 pipeline does not cross my property. I work with the
12 Virginia Wilderness Committee. I'm the executive director
13 of the organization. And the Virginia Wilderness Committee
14 is opposed to the pipeline on national forestland and in
15 particular, the Jefferson National Forest.

PS3A1-210 | 16 We are particularly distressed by the fact that
17 it's going through the Brush Mountain inventoried roadless
18 area, as well as underneath the Appalachian Trail and
19 adjacent to the Peters Mountain Wilderness Area, as well as
20 the Brush Mountain Wilderness Area.

21 We also are not too keen on the fact that the
22 pipeline would cross, I think, 13,000 x-number of feet of
23 semi-primitive, non-motorized land on the national forest.
24 That is a very rare commodity on the forest. And if you put
25 a pipeline right through the middle of it, it is still

PS3A1-208 See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report. Sinkholes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-209 Cultural resources, including historic buildings, are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1 and water resources in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-210 The FS has worked with Mountain Valley to develop project design features, mitigation measures and monitoring procedures to minimize the impacts to the resources those standards were designed to protect. These mitigation measures and monitoring procedures are described in the POD.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-210
cont'd

1 non-motorized, but is no longer semi-primitive, because that
2 semi-primitive nature would be negated by the fact that the
3 pipeline is going through it.

4 We are also not real keen about the fact that
5 there might be some old-growth that would be, you would have
6 to harvest some old-growth in the construction of the
7 pipeline. We are actually big believers in old-growth in
8 that forest.

9 So to recap, we are opposed to it going through
10 national forestland. We are opposed to it going through the
11 Brush Mountain inventoried roadless area. We are opposed to
12 it coming over Peters Mountain and Sinking Creek Mountain.
13 We are opposed to the impacts it might have on the
14 Appalachian Trail. We are opposed to it going through
15 semi-primitive non-motorized land on the national forest and
16 we are opposed to any harvesting of old-growth. Thank you.

17 MS. AMERSON: My name's Marilyn Amerson.

18 MR. AMERSON: Bobby Amerson.

19 MS. AMERSON: And the pipeline is coming close to
20 our property, but not, does not cross it. I'm opposed to
21 this project on three counts, first of which is public
22 safety. The second is the negative effects on the
23 environment, and the third is the economic impact.

24 According to the Center for Effective Government,
25 since 2010, more than 3,300 gas leaks or ruptures have

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

89

1 occurred in the United States. In September 2015 a 30"
2 pipeline exploded in New Mexico and left a crater more than
3 46 feet long and 20 feet deep. Ten members of a family were
4 killed. In 2010, a 30" pipeline ruptured in San Bruno,
5 California, resulting in a crater 72 feet long by 26 feet
6 wide. A 28-foot section of pipe was found 100 feet south of
7 the crater. The resulting fire from the explosion killed
8 eight people and damaged 70 homes.

PS3A1-211

9 The Jonesville Road, where I live, it's a
10 dead-end road. The mountains surround the valley, and
11 that's past the point where the pipeline'll cross the only
12 road into that area. In the event of a fire or explosion,
13 there are more than a dozen families who would have no
14 escape route and it's a remote area, and most of us don't
15 even have cell phone service. We couldn't even call for
16 help.

17 We don't understand why the pipeline companies
18 are willing to build those roads to get farmers to sell them
19 easements and alternative route for farm equipment
20 transportation, but they're unwilling to address the matter
21 of public safety.

PS3A1-212

22 My second opposition on the environmental impact.
23 We feel that the Environmental Impact Statement does not
24 accurately describe the impact this project will really have
25 in this area. The statement says the pipeline would be

PS3A1-211

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment PS2A2-191 regarding monitoring of the pipeline.

PS3A1-212

Karst terrain is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Depth to bedrock and blasting were discussed in section 4.1 and appendix M of the EIS. See also the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-212
cont'd

1 minimally invasive and affecting mainly forestlands.
2 However, the region has very rocky areas.
3 When I was younger, the road that was widened and
4 hard-surfaced through our land became a long-term project
5 because of all the rock that had to be blasted, even though
6 a road bed already existed there. Even today there's a
7 phone line that's routed from the utility pole 50 yards from
8 our home, because they can't put it in the ground, because
9 it's solid rock.

PS3A1-213

10 The area is also subject to hillside erosion.
11 And mudslides pop up whether or not the landscape is covered
12 with vegetation. With the clay soil, deforestation leads to
13 even more erosion on hillsides, and growing grass is almost
14 impossible. VDOT currently wants to rip out the gully on
15 our in our property, because we've been told grass won't
16 grow there.
17 The blasting that will be required to bury a
18 pipeline of such massive size will destroy the wells, fresh
19 mountain water, damage the foundations of homes for untold
20 numbers of people who, just like me, own land close to the
21 route, but have no legal rights because we don't own the
22 land the pipeline will cross.
23 This is very troublesome because the pipeline
24 survey doesn't seem to have examined the topography of these
25 properties. Pipeline routes are changed on a whim with the

PS3A1-213 Landslides are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

91

1 discovery of bats or Indian artifacts, or even stiff
2 opposition. Not once have we seen a study that says a
3 chosen route was selected because of the land lends itself
4 to a lower chance of negative environmental effects.

PS3A1-214

5 Which doesn't allow me to address the economic
6 impacts, which the -- we feel the pipeline companies are
7 making huge profit, but the people in the area are going to
8 suffer because of lower property values, and also pollution,
9 watershed damage. My father, my grandfather owned the land
10 where we live. He lost it in the Great Depression. My
11 father came back and bought this land with money that he
12 made fighting for this country in World War II in the
13 Philippines.

14 This area doesn't even need this much natural
15 gas. Because fracking has already been outlawed in New
16 York. It's come under fire in other areas. A recent
17 article -- I'll wrap up, but I'll say this. To give someone
18 three minutes to express their views on a --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's why we're also taking
20 written records. If you want to give me that --

21 MS. AMERSON: I'll put it in the record, thank
22 you. And I'll put it on --

23 MS. SIEGEL: My name is Cristina Siegel. The
24 pipeline would not cross my land, but it is right across the
25 street. I wanna start out by saying that I, by training, a

PS3A1-214

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
The EIS addressed water resources in section 4.3 and air quality
in section 4.11.1.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 forest soil scientist. I worked four years as a researcher
2 for the forestry department, and I actually did create --
3 EIS is some of our efforts, our research projects. And did
4 a lot of work to mitigate the effects of these kind of big
5 activities on the land.

6 I am now the director of a non-profit
7 organization that focuses on environmental issues. And I
8 live within half a mile of the proposed corridor, as the
9 crow flies. I have a 34-acre tract of beautiful land in
10 Franklin County, and I actually still live on property that
11 the pipeline goes through right now, and we thought about
12 buying that house. So this is -- it's in my neighborhood --
13 it's something I've been working on for years, and I care
14 deeply about it.

15 I do believe that the draft EIS is deeply flawed,
16 based on my professional opinion, and completely inadequate.
17 And for the reasons, I've grouped them by topic. The
18 environmental impacts, Number One. The hydrology of the
19 region, the numbers of springs and creeks and wetlands, and
20 the extremely steep terrain. On my property alone, I
21 probably have three different creeks, a number of wetlands.
22 And I know, right across the road, where the pipeline is
23 going, is very similar terrain. Steep, rugged, rocky.

24 Soil erosion, something I worked on
25 professionally for years. Landslides on steep lands. When

PS3A1-215

PS3A1-215

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The EIS provides a discussion of water resources and wetlands in section 4.3 and steep slopes in section 4.1.

PS3A1-216

PS3A1-216

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-216
cont'd

1 you are putting in pipelines and you are leaving open areas
2 of 50 to 75 feet, it creates tremendous soil disturbance and
3 soil erosion. They do not adequately address that in the
4 EIS. And neither do they have the capacity to monitor
5 those, should it go in, to monitor the activities during the
6 process or after the process, with our current state
7 resources.

PS3A1-217

8 Herbicide control of right-of-ways. In order to
9 keep the land clear, they have to do it one way or the
10 other. And I know that it's impossible to do it by hand, so
11 then you've got herbicides sprayed on steep slopes, which
12 then
13 can -- then soil detaches and can get into our creeks and
14 waterways.

PS3A1-218

15 Forest fragmentation is a serious issue. It's a
16 problem for both forest habitat and for many of our wildlife
17 that live in the area. I'm deeply concerned.

PS3A1-219

18 Also public safety. I live within a half mile of
19 this. I'm concerned about pipes blowing up, pipes leaking,
20 all the safety hazards that go along. And property values.

PS3A1-220

21 That is something that could directly affect me. Loss of

PS3A1-221

22 property value. And I'm deeply disturbed by the imminent
23 domain -- taking of land for unsubstantiated public good.
24 These are commercial efforts for commercial gain and they
25 have not, in any way whatsoever supported that this is good

PS3A1-217 See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides.

PS3A1-218 Forest fragmentation is discussed in section 4.4 of the EIS.

PS3A1-219 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-220 See the response to comment IND12-1 property values.

PS3A1-221 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 for the public.

PS3A1-222

2 And I have a fundamental belief that we need to
3 move away from fossil fuels. This is exactly the wrong way
4 to go, to create hundreds of miles of disturbance for
5 another fossil fuel. Thank you very much.

6 MS. ROSTON: Margaret Roston. [The pipeline]
7 does not cross my land. It's on the adjacent property. The
8 no-action alternative is the logical choice. MVP repeatedly
9 deserves an "F" for its failure to provide accurate
10 information.

11 Every time FERC asks for information, they only
12 give partial answers and often they're not addressing the
13 issue. Their reports have been full of so much stuff, they
14 should've been thrown out because it's a waste of FERC's
15 time to even consider it. If they were in school, they
16 handed in those reports, they would've gotten "F"s and the
17 teacher would've said forget it, you fail.

PS3A1-223

18 There's nothing American about taking a citizen's
19 land against their will for pennies of value by a for-profit
20 company for export. Lots of people have probably talked
21 about the karst, the earthquake zone, and virtually
22 continuous seismic activity.

23 Probably they haven't talked about inadequate
24 insurances required to pay for long-term infrastructure
25 damage or a mega-disaster and certainly not several

PS3A1-222

Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-223

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-224 | 1 disasters at one time as LLC MVP can walk away. This is
2 just not fair. Can dump it all on the taxpayers.

PS3A1-225 | 3 What I'm curious about is who's going to restore
4 the compacted soil. Working on a job site right now with a
5 remodeling thing and all these people are doing is walking
6 around. We're gonna actually have to spend a bunch of money
7 to have -- we've had three days of light equipment driving
8 around, the ground is packed down solid, and we're gonna
9 have to dig it all up to be able to get anything to grow.
10 Who's gonna pay for that. They're not gonna do it on the
11 hillsides or anything.

PS3A1-226 | 12 Also, who's gonna make sure the noxious weeds do
13 not grow up where intact forest once stood? Or a
14 well-tended field once was. Also, there's a narrow driveway
15 right near us going to a telecommunications tower. It washes
16 out with each moderate to heavy downpour, and it's very
17 unsafe to have gravel on the road, because it washes down
18 into our roads, and this is only one pickup truck wide.
19 It's going to be a nightmare when this thing is there, if
20 it's there.

PS3A1-227 | 21 Who's gonna remove the toxins from the pipeline
22 when it is abandoned? Who's gonna fill in the pipeline so
23 it does not collapse in places becoming a fun, yet dangerous
24 place for children to play? Or animals to live. Who is
25 going to make sure that the disintegrating abandoned

PS3A1-224 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility.

PS3A1-225 As discussed in section 4.2 of the EIS, the Applicants would be responsible for decompacting the soil.

PS3A1-226 Invasive species are addressed in section 4.4 of the EIS.

PS3A1-227 Potential abandonment of the proposed facilities is discussed in 2.7 of the EIS. Any abandonment, modification, or re-purposing of the proposed facilities would require a new amendment, or separate application, an environmental review, and authorization from the FERC.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-227
cont'd

1 pipeline does not route water from one place to another?

PS3A1-228

2 I hope that, if this pipeline is permitted by
3 FERC--I definitely don't want it--that FERC will do so only
4 if they forbid MVP to build a compressor station in
5 Virginia. And it is way too much of a coincidence that
6 after the number of people protesting increased due to the
7 compressor station showing up. Then they sudden took it out
8 in Virginia. My husband just had a major heart attack due
9 to all the stress that we've been under, and we can't sell
10 our house and we've gotta downsize. We've worked three
11 years to build this property up. It's now worth zero
12 because nobody's looking at it.

PS3A1-229

13 MS. SHERMAN: Ruth Sherman. So karst land is
14 composed of sinkholes, springs and caves. The proposed
15 pipeline cannot be safely built in most of southwest
16 Virginia due to the karst land, the steep mountain slopes,
17 and the potential for serious erosion.

18 This pipeline will cause irreparable damage to
19 the fragile mountain ecosystems, destroy the groundwater and
20 surface water resources. MVP should not be approved.

21 MR. HEIL: My name is Ellison Heil. So there's
22 an individual that stepped in here earlier. You all may
23 remember him. His name was Bear Redstar. He was from North
24 Dakota. He was just very intrigued by the similarities
25 being tied between those individuals currently in Standing

PS3A1-228

See the response to comment IND175-6 regarding new project components not addressed in the EIS. No compressor station is proposed in Virginia.

PS3A1-229

See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipelines in karst terrain.. The EIS provides a discussion of karst in section 4.1 and water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 Rock, North Dakota, fighting the Dakota Access Pipeline, and
2 those individuals who are standing together in the
3 Appalachia's of West Virginia and Virginia, and would like
4 to draw similarities between these two current issues
5 presenting themselves in the United States.

PS3A1-230

6 And then secondly are my concerns about the karst
7 topography in this region, having just returned from Nepal
8 back in 2015, I felt the severity of what an earthquake can
9 do to a community, and while southwest Virginia may never
10 see the intensity on a Richter scale that Nepal experienced
11 back in 2015, a small earthquake could have devastating
12 impacts on this community, especially if a pipeline was to
13 go through the area and cause destruction to our water in
14 this area.

15 Companies such as Deschutes have picked Virginia
16 in particular, Roanoke because of our high-quality water and
17 having pipelines come through this area could be destructive
18 to future organization and institutions finding themselves
19 in the Roanoke and New River Valleys. Thank you.

20 MR. PECKMAN: My name is Robert, otherwise known
21 as Bob, Peckman. No, [the pipeline] does not [cross my
22 property]. First comment on the draft EIS is -- I have seen
23 many DEIS's and I have never seen one for a project that had
24 not yet been defined. But the -- the scoping out the
25 properties hasn't even been completed -- so I don't see how

PS3A1-231

PS3A1-230

Karst and earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A1-231

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 you could write the DEIS.

PS3A1-232

2 The DEIS in the executive summary says that there
3 will be limited negative impacts. That's a value judgment.
4 It says that the FERC is already making decisions, even
5 though the project hasn't been fully defined yet. They
6 don't have the data in yet. They're supposed to be
7 gathering data, and yet they're making decisions. And that
8 may be true that it's limited, but that doesn't mean that
9 the negative impacts are not huge. And in fact, they're
10 much less than the positive impacts of having the pipeline.

11 For example, it's assumed that the pipeline is
12 not gonna leaked. It's assumed that the pipeline's not
13 gonna break. There are a lot of assumptions made. Having
14 worked in the industry with dangerous things, when you're
15 looking for safety you don't assume something's not gonna
16 happen. You assume that the bad things are gonna happen and
17 you figure out what you're gonna do for them. So just
18 saying, "well, we're probably not gonna get an earthquake in
19 the next 20 years, and the pipeline'll probably be gone by
20 then," that's any way to do safety.

PS3A1-233

21 The pipeline will have negative impacts that last
22 much longer than the positive impacts. The pipeline is
23 designed to be built on grades that don't really heal after
24 you mess them up. Now I work with the Appalachian Trail
25 Conservancy and we build trails. The Appalachian Trail up

PS3A1-232

See the response to comment FA11-2. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-233

Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.2 of the EIS. The ANST is addressed in section 4.8.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-234

1 in Roanoke. And we build trails to a maximum grade of 15%.
2 We go out a clinometer and we measure. We don't build
3 anything greater than 15% because greater than that will
4 erode.

5 Now if you look at Tinker Mountain. I think if I
6 see it from here, if you look at Tinker Mountain with all
7 the telephone towers on top, etcetera, you'll see there's a
8 piece of ground that has slid from being cleared for the
9 power lines and that was decades ago, and it hasn't healed.
10 And has no sign of healing.

11 FERC, the DEIS just doesn't take into account the
12 losses --

13 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Peter Anderson. And
14 I'm here representing Appalachian Voices, which is a
15 regional non-profit organization.

16 The Mountain Valley Pipeline project is not in
17 the public interest and I urge you to reject its
18 application. First, it is not necessary and FERC cannot

PS3A1-235

19 show a public need for it. Recent studies by Synapse
20 Economics and the Institute for Energy Economics and
21 Financial Analysis demonstrate that existing gas
22 infrastructure is more than sufficient to meet regional
23 energy needs for residents and businesses.

24 The primary beneficiaries of this project will be
25 private energy developers. This is deeply concerning given

PS3A1-234

Construction on steep slopes is addressed in sections 2 and 4.1.

PS3A1-235

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. The Commission would decide if the projects are in the public interest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 that a certificate of public convenience and necessity would
2 allow for the taking of private property for this project.

PS3A1-236

3 Second, public safety is at great risk. The
4 draft EIS provides no reason for people living within the
5 blast radius to feel safe. There has been in a spike in
6 pipeline leaks and explosions, especially involving
7 infrastructure installed this decade.

PS3A1-236

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-237

8 Third, water quality is of great concern. The
9 MVP's proposed route would cross hundreds of water bodies
10 and drinking water sources. Yet the DEIS merely says that
11 MVP would evaluate complaints and identify suitable
12 settlements if drinking water is contaminated. This is
13 insufficient and recklessly places profits above public
14 health and safety.

PS3A1-237

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A1-238

15 Fourth, the DEIS fails to adequately address the
16 greenhouse gas life cycle, including upstream and downstream
17 leaks and combustion emissions. This is insufficient
18 analysis under NEPA and NEPA jurisprudence.

PS3A1-238

GHGs and climate change is addressed in section 4.13.

PS3A1-239

19 Fifth, the DEIS concedes permanent adverse
20 impacts to forests, including thousands of acres of prime
21 forests, farmland, and listed species' habitats. The U.S.
22 Forest Service has raised several of these issues, yet they
23 have so far been largely ignored by FERC and the MVP project
24 partners.

PS3A1-239

See the response to comment IND155-2. The FS is a cooperating agency and assisted the FERC in preparation of the EIS.

25 Sixth, the DEIS states that one West Virginia

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-240 1 compressor station will violate air quality standards and
2 require a permit from that state environmental agency.
3 There's also evidence in record in Montgomery County,
4 Virginia, that MVP developers continue to attempt to site a
5 fourth compressor station in the county after MVP submitted
6 its application to FERC last fall. FERC must state
7 definitively whether additional compression will be required
8 along the pipeline route and if so, it must consider the
9 impacts of additional compression within the context of the
10 proposal, including cumulative effects.

PS3A1-241 11 Finally, the environmental justice analysis in
12 the DEIS is grossly insufficient. 14 of 17 counties along
13 the route have poverty rates above state averages, yet the
14 DEIS states that environmental impacts will be somehow
15 mitigated by local spending during construction. Any
16 temporary economic bump provides does nothing to reduce
17 environmental and public health impacts.

18 So again, the MVP is not in the public interest,
19 and for these reasons, I urge you to reject the Mountain
20 Valley Pipeline application. Thank you.

PS3A1-242 21 MS. DUVALL: My name is Megan Duvall. My main
22 comment is regarding the amendment to the U.S. Forest
23 Service Plan. I oppose the project's specific amendments,
24 ones that would exceed restrictions on soil and riparian
25 corridor conditions, that would remove old-growth trees and

PS3A1-240 See the response to comment IND175-6 regarding new project components not addressed in the EIS.

PS3A1-241 We stand by our analysis of environmental justice in section 4.9.

PS3A1-242 See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1 regarding Amendments to the LRMP.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 that would cross the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

2 I also oppose the pipeline because I believe that

PS3A1-243

3 it is dangerous and benefits only a very few people and our

4 focus needs to be on investing in new technology and new

5 industries that are clean energy.

6 MS. BOSTIC: My name is Janice Bostic. And I am

7 not a landowner. So I'm here also on behalf of my

8 grandparents who were subsistence farmers George and Leona

9 Shiars, born and raised and buried in Craig County.

10 Fracking is not taking our country forward. It

11 is only for the short-term gain of a few, at a price to the

PS3A1-244

12 many that is spelled tragedy. Craig County does not have

13 the money, equipment, or manpower to handle accidents, much

14 less explosions along the route of the pipeline, nor does

15 Giles County.

16 Pumping high-pressure natural gas through a 42"

17 pipeline has not been done before. And they want to do it

18 across private and forest service lands filled with

19 wildlife, sinkholes, caves, over rocky, steep terrain with

20 mountain streams and aquifers. It is pure madness. It is

21 motivated only by greed, devoid of common sense or reason.

PS3A1-245

22 The ugly scar that would be running across our

23 area would be a detriment to our economy. People are moving

PS3A1-246

24 and settling here for the views, the hiking, the outdoor

25 life. The eyesore and danger that a 42" high-pressure

PS3A1-243

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefit. Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A1-244

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PS3A1-245

The right-of-way would be restored and revegetated following construction (see section 2.4.2 of the EIS). Visual resources are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS3A1-246

Visual resources are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-246
cont'd

1 pipeline would cause provides zero economic gain. In fact,
2 a negative impact. Again, it would be only for the
3 short-term profits of a few.

4 FERC's mission statement: Assist consumers in
5 obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy
6 services at a reasonable cost through appropriate regulatory
7 and market means. Fracked gas is not efficient, nor is it
8 sustainable. High-pressure pipelines are not reliable nor
9 sustainable.

PS3A1-247

10 The cost. What is the cost? Lowered property
11 values, lost tourist dollars, clean-ups, and no one is
12 calculating the true environmental human cost of fracking.
13 This proposed pipeline, pumping fracked gas through our area
14 with no benefit to us, but only opening up for loss and for
15 danger environmentally and economically, would seem to be
16 contrary to the mission statement of FERC. Please say no
17 and disallow this MVP pipeline.

18 MR. BESKAR: My name is Herb Beskar. I live in
19 Roanoke City, and no, the pipeline would not affect my
20 property. Well, first of all, I would just like to
21 prologue, I guess, my comments a bit. And that is, the
22 editorial in today's paper, unfortunately, summed it up
23 pretty good, I thought. And that is the difficulty in
24 believing in the integrity of the process with the fossil
25 fuel industry so influential with FERC and even funding of

PS3A1-247

See the response to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.
See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic
fracturing. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding
benefits.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 their work.

2 But be that as it may, I would like to address
3 some specific environmental issues. Since I'm not directly
4 affected by the pipeline, I have friends who are up on that
5 mountain and so on, but being in Roanoke City, the specific
6 environmental issue that I'm concerned is about water.

PS3A1-248

7 Since Roanoke City receives a bunch of its water from
8 upstream on the Roanoke River and from that catchment area.

PS3A1-248

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

9 Specifically the issue of erosion -- first of
10 all, just the disruption of the streams and rivers during
11 construction, inevitably that is going to cause tremendous
12 amount of sediment and debris going into the water streams.

PS3A1-249

PS3A1-249

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. A revised discussion of sedimentation and turbidity can be found in section 4.3 of the EIS and in the response to comment FA11-15. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

13 And then because of the geological features of that area
14 with the karst formations and so on, it's just inevitable
15 that during construction and especially afterwards, there is
16 going to be -- any leak over those formations will go down
17 to the water table which will affect wells and the water
18 through the water table that Roanoke City receives from the
19 river and even from their pumping.

PS3A1-250

PS3A1-250

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

20 And we've had a number of leaks and breaks and
21 explosions lately in pipelines around the country. Alabama
22 last week. And so it's inevitable that there is going to be
23 environmental damage specifically to our water supply. And
24 unfortunately I don't know -- there's no way that the
25 industry can say it will not happen, and based on history,

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

105

1 it will happen. So in terms of rivers and streams, I would
2 think that's a significant environmental impact.

PS3A1-251

3 And then the other water issue would be
4 individuals with private wells. I know a number of people
5 in the Bent Mountain area in Montgomery County who have
6 private wells, who have the pipeline going very close to
7 their homes, if they aren't losing their homes as it is. So
8 the private wells are under great threat.

PS3A1-251

Wells are discussed in section 4.3.

9 And then I would like to just -- another issue
10 is, just very briefly, and that is -- it's not addressed in
11 this impact statement, but that is -- we're speaking of
12 specific environmental concerns and that is -- the big
13 picture is that if we continue to use fossil fuels at the
14 rate we are and don't cut back faster, we are truly
15 threatening the earth environment. We're threatening our
16 very civilization, not only in our country, but on the
17 planet. Thank you very much.

PS3A1-252

18 MS. RICE: My name is Jane Rice. And the
19 pipeline does not cross any of my property. So I came in
20 this room multiple times before you people as you are aware
21 and as I was doing that, I noticed people said a lot of
22 repetitive things that I'm sure you're heard multiple times.
23 Been in here all night listening to everyone's comments.
24 And while I do agree with all of those, they've already been
25 said.

PS3A1-252

See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

106

1 So I'm not gonna go over all of those, the
2 topography and the beautifulness and yada-yada that you've
3 heard, probably through your whole process of this. But I
4 do agree with them and since I've been here all day, I
5 thought I would come in and just state my opposition to the
6 Mountain Valley Pipeline.

7 I'm a student at Roanoke College, a junior
8 studying environmental science. I enjoy it a lot. I'm from
9 Charleston, South Carolina, which I'm not sure if you've
10 been there or not, but it's totally flat. No mountains,
11 below sea level. Love it though.

12 And I came to Roanoke because I wanted to have a
13 change of scenery and see the mountains. I went from the
14 beach to the mountains. And you see all the pictures, the
15 Blue Ridge Parkway and Appalachian Mountains, but it really
16 is -- and you hear about how beautiful it is -- but you
17 really can't appreciate it, I personally think, until you
18 see it, until you hike up McAfee Knob and Devil's Marble
19 Yard and Sawtooth, and all that and just, like the miserable
20 hike up it, and then you just get stunned by the beauty and
21 awe. The millions of photos that you've seen just don't put
22 it into words or how amazing it really is.

23 And I also don't have much of any type of
24 background. I don't know much about pipelines. I honest --
25 I couldn't tell you if a pipe, what pipelines are in South

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

107

1 Carolina, but the Roanoke College has encouraged us to be
2 aware of what's going on in our communities, everything
3 that's going on.

4 So the environmental science program is really up
5 with Mountain Valley Pipeline as it's -- not project -- but
6 encouraged us so much to learn as much as we can about it.
7 And it really -- just my first experience with the mountains
8 and to learn about a pipeline, it just -- I don't wanna say
9 the word. It did kind of hit me all at once, I guess is the
10 best way to put it. And I -- that's why I decided to come
11 and be so involved and do everything that I can with the
12 Appalachian Trail Club and Conservancy and everything else,
13 help them record people and all of that, so --

14 For me, I just wanted to come and state my
15 thoughts and state my opposition and -- I don't know if
16 you've been hiking around here, but I really encourage you
17 to go hike McAfee Knob or Shark Top, and just really see how
18 beautiful it is here, because it is life-changing and it is
19 amazing and it's the best feeling in the world to hike up a
20 mountain and see just how wonderful this earth is. And I
21 don't think a pipeline should cross through that. That's
22 all I have to say.

23 MR. KASTNING: First name is Ernst. Last name is
24 Kastning. I am not a landowner. I live nearby. I own
25 land, but it's not -- the pipeline does not cross my --

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

108

1 In July I submitted an 80-page report on the
2 geological hazards related to the pipeline. It was
3 submitted to FERC on behalf of Sierra Club out of
4 Charlottesville, and on behalf of POWHR. That report went
5 in in July. I am not certain whether it has been reviewed
6 by FERC because of the timing. My only comment is that if
7 it has not been reviewed, it's 80 pages of text, very
8 detailed about the geology. If it has not been reviewed, I
9 want it to be looked at.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll stop you right here. I'll
11 stop the clock. Yes, I know. I have just started to peruse
12 it --

13 MR. KASTNING: But you answered my question. I
14 actually wasn't gonna do anything here. But then I talked
15 --

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, you can go. I just wanted
17 to give you that information. You asked a question, I
18 answered it.

19 MR. KASTNING: Okay, good. It's very important
20 that the implications of the geologic hazards that I address
21 be looked at. I'm most concerned about the karst part
22 because even though just about every karst feature within
23 the pipeline proposed corridor is listed, I am not certain
24 about the fact that they're all those features there and
25 there were two connected beneath the ground. I'm not

PS3A1-253

PS3A1-253

Dr. Kastning's report is cited and discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Springs are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-253
cont'd

1 certain if that part has been addressed appropriately, that
2 this is a large system of groundwater, and that's really my
3 concern.

4 MR. REED: My name is Ernest Reed. I am an
5 intervenor with this. I also represent three groups that
6 are also intervening in the process, Wild Virginia, Friends
7 of Nelson and Heartwood. I do not own property that this is
8 going through, with the exception of the Jefferson National
9 Forest.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right, because all Americans own
11 the national forests.

PS3A1-254

12 MR. REED: I didn't even have to say that. I'm
13 mostly concerned today for this three minutes about the area
14 that goes through the Jefferson National Forest. The route
15 that goes by Peters Mountain Wilderness along Mystery Ridge,
16 there's a spring at the intersection of the access road and
17 Mystery Ridge Road which is right on the route. It's
18 well-flagged in blue flag tape. I was up there two weeks
19 ago to see it, not mentioned in the DEIS. I can't
20 understand why it would be flagged and made such a big deal
21 of on site, but it's not mentioned in the DEIS.

PS3A1-255

22 Also, the route as it comes down on the edge of
23 Peters Mountain, if there's a 125-foot construction corridor
24 there, it's gonna compromise the wilderness values of the
25 wilderness, because of the visual quality and also the

PS3A1-254

Springs are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A1-255

Visual is addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. The comments about the American chestnut are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-255
cont'd

1 intrusion of invasive species and predatory species into the
2 wilderness area. There's a population of Native American
3 Chestnuts in Peters Mountain wilderness and there's also
4 chestnut trees that are sprouting from seed that are right
5 adjacent to the center line of the ACP as it's proposed to
6 go through there. And they do not have chestnut.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: This is not about the ACP. This
8 is Mountain Valley.

PS3A1-256

9 MR. REED: I meant Mountain Valley. I'm sorry.
10 I meant MVP. There's also a population of hemlock that do
11 not have all the data there. I've got photographs of them.
12 I'll be submitting them with my further comments when I send

PS3A1-256 Comments noted.

PS3A1-257

13 those in. So those are very problematic. The Brush
14 Mountain wilderness that the MVP would be running adjacent
15 to is going through an inventoried roadless area. That
16 inventoried roadless area does not allow the cutting of
17 trees any larger in diameter than 12" because that's what
18 the roadless rule specifies.

PS3A1-257 See the response to comment CO26-1.

19 I don't imagine that it will be possible to build
20 that route without cutting those trees. Also, there can't
21 be any access roads in that roadless area by definition, nor
22 can vehicles use the proposed route as a vehicular access in
23 the future. It would seem to be inconsistent with the
24 roadless rule. So that I think that that's a conflict that
25 can't really be resolved or mitigated along with those

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-257 | 1 wilderness areas. I'm done.
conf'd | 2 MR. BRISTOLL: My name is Benjamin Bristoll. I
3 do not own land that the pipeline crosses. I live in
4 Roanoke here, but not where the pipeline will be here.
5 MS. D'GAIA: Gayla D'Gaia. I live in Roanoke
6 City and I do not live where a pipeline is gonna directly
7 cross.
8 MR. BRISTOLL: I guess I -- there's so much to
9 say, but I -- I asked that you please oppose approval of
10 this pipeline because I feel that it endangers the safety of
PS3A1-258 | 11 a lot of people going all through the area here, because of
12 the unstable terrain and I've seen how many pipeline
13 explosions have been in recent years.
14 I also think that it's not needed because it's
PS3A1-259 | 15 mostly just being built to export the gas overseas and not
16 to be used for domestic use, so that does not -- I don't
17 think that constitutes a public good use. That's more of a
18 private commercial enterprise for profit that's not serving
19 the public interest. So for those reasons, I ask that you
20 deny this pipeline approval.
21 MS. D'GAIA: I oppose the pipeline for the
22 reasons of the inability for citizens to be able to monitor
23 or have any real control over the regulation of the
PS3A1-260 | 24 pipelines. I'm also very concerned about the direction that
25 our markets are going, currently with a, with an overstock

PS3A1-258 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A1-259 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A1-260 The commenter's statements regarding regulation and abundance of natural gas are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3A1-260 | 1 of these types of resources.

cont'd

2 I'm not exactly sure if the gas pipeline issue is
3 in the same ballfield as the Exxon issues that are coming
4 up, where there's just too much and stocks are decreasing.
5 But I also recognize the impact of the fossil fuels on our
6 economy and know that we really do have to work together on
7 finding a solution to move us out of these very precarious
8 situations where we are really damaging lives and putting
9 lives at risk, and also damaging the environment and the
10 structure beneath the ground, creating leaks and things like
11 that.

12 And I feel like our best cause is basically being
13 to really find a way to instigate the type of change that
14 would have people who are investing, the stockholders and
15 the companies and the private interests, to begin to change
16 that route. And if there is some reason why that really,
17 really can't happen, other than it's just, that's the way
18 they want it to be, then I would like to see real
19 information come out to the public about why that is.

20 I know that there is United States economy and
21 the global economy are dependent on our interests in fossil
22 fuels, but I do think that we really have to move away from
23 that. And I'm not asking anyone to do anything that I
24 myself have not done, because I have been in a situation to
25 be married to a person of great wealth, we're talking not

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

113

1 millions of dollars, we're talking in the billions of
2 dollars, and what I can say is that, at the end of the day,
3 it really is not worth putting so many lives at risk and the
4 environment at risk, to do these things.

5 We can do better. And I really wanna support
6 just a very deep heart-felt response from FERC and from the
7 private interests that are involved in this. And I
8 appreciate you doing that.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

114

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Roanoke, Virginia

16 Date: November 3, 2016

17 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
18 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
19 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
20 of the proceedings.

21

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. CAYWOOD: Richard Caywood. I am the
3 Assistant County Administrator for Roanoke County and I'm
4 here today to speak on behalf of Roanoke County and the
5 Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. I'd like to start by
6 expressing Roanoke County's concern with the public input
7 process being utilized by FERC tonight.

8 While FERC has utilized the term public input
9 sessions, the process being utilized is, by its very nature,
10 not public, as we are sitting in a room with three people
11 and closed doors. Public involvement on projects governed
12 by the NEPA process and the FERC approval process should be
13 just that -- public.

PS3A2-1

14 An important aspect of public involvement is the
15 opportunity for citizens to hear the opinions of their
16 fellow citizens and learn from one another. Therefore, it
17 defies logic that FERC is taking public input privately.
18 FERC indicates that it will transcribe and publish every
19 comment in the project register. Therefore, it seems highly
20 inappropriate and illogical to take these very same comments
21 privately.

22 FERC accepts comments by mail or electronically
23 throughout the project approval process. The notion that
24 FERC must take public comments privately because some
25 individuals are reluctant to speak in front of crowds or due

PS3A2-1

See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. The sessions were open to the public, and all comments were placed into the FERC public record. The sessions do not represent a "hearing," but rather a means to obtain verbal comments on the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 to time constraints seems disingenuous at best.

2 It seems abundantly clear that the primary
3 objective of FERC in making this change in its public input
4 process is to avoid creating a public forum and to further
5 avoid community awareness of concerns about these very
6 substantial projects. While true public hearings can be
7 uncomfortable and occasionally unruly, they are a critical
8 component of projects with public oversight.

9 Roanoke County, for example, uses true public
10 hearings on all of our rezoning projects, rezoning processes
11 in the county, and we have often very long meetings and
12 people have very heated feelings. However, we've always
13 seen the importance in taking the comments of this nature in
14 a public forum for all to see, the media, citizens. We even
15 run those meetings on TV for people to see.

PS3A2-2

16 Roanoke County respectfully implores the FERC to
17 reconsider this effort to redefine the public participation
18 in the projects it regulates. Roanoke County is also

PS3A2-3

19 concerned about the very incomplete state of the DEIS at the
20 time of its release by FERC. Today is November 3rd. On
21 Monday, October 31st, I received literally thousands of
22 pages of additional materials to supplement the recently
23 published DEIS. This material was substantially more
24 voluminous than the actual document itself.

25 Since one of the main components of the

PS3A2-2

The current session format for taking comments on the draft EIS is being used by the FERC for all its major natural gas projects across the nation, and is not something new or different being used just for MVP.

PS3A2-3

See the response to comment LA3-1 regarding MVP's October 2016 filings and extension of the comment period. The draft EIS was not incomplete at the time of its issuance. The supplemental data related to minor route modifications, some of which were recommended in the draft EIS. We believe the public has an appropriate period to comment on the supplemental data, up to the end of December 2016. In addition, we provided new landowners along the route modifications an extended opportunity to comment up through February 21, 2017. This final EIS revises the draft and analyzes the supplemental data.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

119

PS3A2-3
cont'd

1 supplemental materials was the actual proposed pipeline
2 alignment, it seems very hard to believe that the DEIS
3 would've been published in advance of that information.
4 Therefore, Roanoke County would request consideration for
5 extending the public comment period and republishing the
6 DEIS in a more complete form. I appreciate the ability to
7 comment.

8 MS. GIVENS: My name is Karolyn Givens. And our
9 farm is located at 199 Leffel Lane in Newport, Virginia.
10 I'm a member of the organization Preserve Historic Newport
11 Properties, an organization dedicated to preserving this
12 historic community. I want to tell you about the village of
13 Newport, part of the Newport Historic District, which sits
14 at the base of Sinking Creek Mountain, and about the Greater
15 Newport Rural Historic District located in Sinking Creek
16 Valley, which extends along the Blue Grass Trail east of the
17 village.

18 Sinking Creek has been farm since colonial times,
19 before the revolution. My husband, who is now 80, grew up
20 in that valley in a house that his great-great-grandfather
21 built in 1790, and that his great-grandfather, his
22 grandfather, his father and he, my husband, were all born
23 in. That is the nature of the beautiful Sinking Creek
24 Valley. The people who migrated west from colonial
25 settlements to the east, and some who stayed and continued

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

120

1 to farm that valley for generations.

2 Newport Village and the Greater Newport Rural
3 Historic District includes houses, farmhouses and barns and
4 outbuildings, churches, an old iron ore furnace, old wagon
5 creek wheel roads and bridges, including three covered
6 bridges. Centuries-old springs up on Sinking Creek Mountain
7 have fed water to the farmhouses, as well as to the cattle,
8 horses, goats, sheep and chickens raised on those farms.
9 And that irrigated the crop lands of hay and corn. This
10 agricultural community has thrived since the 1700s.

PS3A2-4

11 Newport is but one of eight historic communities
12 nestled in the Appalachian Mountains that the Mountain
13 Valley Pipeline threatens to tear apart with the current
14 proposed route. The pipeline is slated to come in from the
15 north of Newport Village next to the historic Mt. Olivet
16 Church across from the Hardwick House. From there the
17 pipeline will cross the Blue Grass Trail and rip right
18 through 80-year-old Mr. Earl Eckles' property. He has been
19 told by MVP that he will simply have to give up his home and
20 relocate.

21 The proposed pipeline will continue on close to
22 the Newport Volunteer Rescue Squad housed in the vocational
23 agricultural building of the historic Newport High School,
24 and now the Newport Recreation Center and Fairgrounds. And
25 next to the ballfield where, for generations, children have

PS3A2-4

Impacts on Historic Districts are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church is located about 430 feet away from the pipeline. Representatives of Mountain Valley have indicated that they do not intend to take Mr. Echol's house, or remove him from it. The company seeks to negotiate an easement across his land. The Newport Volunteer Fire Department building is about 3,353 feet away from the pipeline; the Newport Recreational Center building is 945 feet away. The Leffel Mansion is 2,034 feet away from the pipeline; while the Adlai Jones farm house (George Jones) is 1,791 feet away. The Deplazes house is about 907 feet away from the pipeline. None of those buildings should be adversely effected by the MVP.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

121

1 come to play ball, the Newport Recreational Center and
2 Fairgrounds is where the oldest continuous annual
3 agricultural fair in Virginia is held.

4 From there, the pipeline is scheduled to cross up
5 over the hill, turn east and then as it is constructed,
6 devastate one farm after another in the greater Newport
7 Rural Historic District. That destruction will include our
8 historic Leffel Farm, which my husband and I have farmed for
9 decades, and the George Jones Farm--George is 87--a farm
10 which has been existence since the Revolution, and is now
11 being farmed by younger members of the family.

12 So the Mountain Valley Pipeline will ravish the
13 village and the pristine farms and the valley beyond. But
14 in addition to the pipeline, MVP will use 7 Oaks Road, a
15 gravel country road that runs along a spring-fed creek,
16 leading from Blue Grass Trail up a relatively steep hill,
17 eventually within feet of a farmhouse that sits on the side
18 of 7 Oak Road. MVP plans to use 7 Oaks Road as an access
19 road by constructing an extension up to the pipeline.

20 Jude and Jerilyn Deplasse[SP] own and farm
21 7 Oaks Farm and they have for over fifty years. They've
22 raised grass-fed beef, goats, horses, chickens and ducks.
23 They chose that farm because it was at the end of the road,
24 a peaceful haven. Jude will tell Jerilyn in the morning as
25 he goes out the door that he's moving the cattle from Fossil

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 Ridge over to the north pasture up to the meadow.

2 MR. OWEN: My name is Clark Owen. I'm a resident
3 of Roanoke County. I'm here to represent my son, whose name
4 is Richard Clark Owen. He's a resident of Hanover County,
5 but he owns property in Franklin County, and my property is
6 in Roanoke County.

7 I live at the foot of Bent Mountain and Poor
8 Mountain, which is downhill from the proposed Mountain

PS3A2-5

9 Valley Pipeline. My only concern about it would be the
10 watershed. I'm on a well system, and being downhill, I'm
11 close to both mountains. Obviously if there was a major
12 problem, my watershed could be affected.

13 My son, however, and his mother has a life estate
14 in his property, which is on Wildwood Road near Boones Mill

PS3A2-6

15 in Franklin County. It's right in the crosshairs of the
16 pipeline and Mountain Valley wants to put in a staging area
17 and maintenance area and have a permanent right-of-way. And
18 that property is within the blast zone, which is I
19 understand is a couple hundred yards from the center in each
20 direction. So that's two properties that are in question.

21 I understand that FERC's responsibility is to
22 weigh the public benefit of this project versus the
23 potential harm. And those affected are -- many in rural
24 areas are not able to "hook up", you know if it was a road
25 or an electrical line or something, they would be able to

PS3A2-5

Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A2-6

See the response to comment PS1B1-10 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-7 | 1 hook up to the thing so they get really zero benefit if it
2 was a road or power line or something, they could at least
3 use that, so in my opinion, there is little or no public
4 benefit, certainly to the citizens that could be affected.

5 But there is damage potential, watershed,
6 explosion. We've had the two in Alabama, one in
7 Pennsylvania County where this pipeline is to connect with
8 another one. And that would be, you know, my opinion
9 overall and the reason if FERC is following the goal of
10 weighing the public benefit versus the potential harm, it
11 should deny the pipeline's request.

PS3A2-8 | 12 Mountain Valley itself has been very difficult to
13 deal with. Again, I'm representing my son and his mother,
14 who could not be here. But [Mountain Valley] has been on
15 the property four times with no notice. They have given
16 notice one time and didn't show. When they do come in for
17 the survey, they kind of sneak in and they are not forthwith
18 with the neighbors, and they have been difficult to deal
19 with.

20 The interesting thing is, they come in for a
21 survey, and this is a proposal that they've given my son.
22 I'd like to highlight some of the things in the landowner
23 questionnaire that they want us to fill out. They want us
24 to tell 'em any existing wells within 150 feet of the limit
25 of disturbance, which the well is, and that's something they

PS3A2-7 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PS3A2-8 Comments noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 could certainly obtain from the survey.
2 They want the locations of septic systems.
3 That's also within 150 feet of the LOD. Any structures,
4 they're very obvious. There are two, the residence and an
5 outbuilding, both modern. Any existing utilities, a power
6 line goes over the proposed right-of-ways, and I know
7 they're bringing in some big equipment and so it is amazing
8 to me that someone would trespass at least four times on
9 your property for the purposes of a survey, then ask you to
10 fill out, go out and measure and see if you're within 100
11 feet of this. I mean it just, you know, I've been around
12 real estate, just to make real estate loans, and the survey
13 is supposed to point those things out.

PS3A2-9

14 The jobs card, in my view, there are plenty of
15 openings already around, and not enough good people to fill
16 'em and I wanna thank you for this opportunity to present
17 our points and your consideration of my points.

18 MR. RHUDY: My name is Alexander Rhudy. The
19 pipeline proposed to cross my land at Mile Marker 253.1.
20 And actually I met with the people in charge of acquiring
21 right-of-ways today--they were on my property--and addressed

PS3A2-10

22 some issues and one of the main concerns from the very
23 beginning has been this Japanese Stiltgrass, which is the
24 most invasive stuff I've ever seen in my life. But in
25 reading the initial environmental study, one thing that I've

PS3A2-9

See the response to comment IND281-2 regarding jobs in Virginia.

PS3A2-10

See the response to comment IND343-1 regarding invasive species.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-10
cont'd | 1 noticed that is pretty vague in it, is on the "restoring
2 after the construction".

PS3A2-11 | 3 And they go into talking about what they're gonna
4 do for the right-of-way. Well, they don't specify whether
5 that's for the 50-foot wide permanent right-of-way, or does
6 that include the 75-foot construction part of it also. From
7 what I've read, that's very lacking. They just wanna let
8 that 75 feet kind of go back to whatever it was before
9 without a lot of effort being put into restoring it to some
10 sustainable state.

PS3A2-12 | 11 And where it's crossing my land it's in the
12 timber, and of course, that 75 foot is gonna take out a lot
13 of large timber. And that needs to be reforested in some
14 way. The Virginia Department of Forestry requires if I cut
15 timber, I have to go back and replant timber. And I've done
16 that on my property and other parts of it.

PS3A2-13 | 17 And so that 75-foot construction right-of-way
18 needs to be addressed more specifically in the next
19 Environmental Impact Statement because it's totally lacking
20 in this one. And I've got a 600-and some page book right
21 here beside of me that I've been reading. I've read over
22 400 pages of it. And I haven't found anything that really
23 is very specific.

24 There's a lot of foggy stuff in it. You're know,
25 they're gonna plant some kind of wildlife mixture or native

PS3A2-11 Mountain Valley proposes to use a nominal 125-foot wide construction right-of-way, and retain 50 feet of its permanent operational easements; which means that 75 feet would be temporary workspace to be restored after pipeline installation. Restoration is discussed in section 2.4.2.8 of the EIS.

PS3A2-12 Mountain Valley would compensate you for the loss of timber. As discussed in the EIS, the right-of-way would be seeded using seed mixes as discussed in section 4.4.

PS3A2-13 Seed mixes are provided in appendix N. See the response to comment IND343-1 regarding invasive species.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-13
cont'd

1 plants. Well, what is that? You know, there's thirty-two
2 invasive species listed in this book. And that are noxious.
3 And so there's a lot lacking in detail in this assessment so
4 far. So all of that needs to be specified so that me, as a

PS3A2-14

5 landowner, that I feel like that my land is gonna be
6 restored somewhat to a sustainable profitable position
7 because I grow timber on this land, market timber on it.
8 That's a really -- that and the wildlife habitat for hunting
9 is the only reason I own the land.

10 I have a small cabin on it and I use it during
11 hunting season and other times of the year, but it's mostly
12 a place that I grow timber and provide habitat for wildlife
13 where I hunt. So I hope they'll look at this very
14 carefully. I didn't use my three minutes. So that's all I
15 gotta say. No 30-second warning, right?

16 MS. COLLINS: My name is Frances Williams Doughty
17 Collins. I'm from Newport, Virginia, Giles County. My
18 property is located at Milepost 213. As a MVP pipeline

PS3A2-15

19 opponent, I would like to cite several important and crucial
20 items. I have a great concern for the contamination of my
21 family's water supply of spring water, beautiful forest
22 land, farm land and an early 1800s iron ore furnace that
23 once provided employment for my neighbors.

24 MVP wants to destroy our late 1800s family farm,
25 which has been passed down for five generations in Newport,

PS3A2-14

As stated in section 2.4 of the EIS, vegetation would generally be cut or scraped flush with the surface of the ground, leaving rootstock in place where possible. Merchantable timber would be cut to useable lengths and stacked on the edge of the right-of-way. Typically, cut timber would be disposed in accordance with landowner wishes; unless the Applicants purchase the timber as part of their compensation agreements.

PS3A2-15

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. The pipeline would be about 1,362 feet away from the Sinking Creek Iron Ore Furnace. The MVP would not destroy the historic Doughty Farm. Restoration is discussed in section 2.4.2.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		127
PS3A2-16	1 Virginia in Giles County. Why would you destroy this? I'm 2 opposed to MVP survey which crosses over Canoe Cave on my 3 Grandfather Doughty's farm in Giles County. This cave has a 4 depth of about five to ten feet over three lakes that 5 contain this distinct species of wildlife.	
PS3A2-17	6 MVP surveyors have not considered the damage that 7 a 42" pipeline would do to cropland, trees that took years 8 to mature, structures that are essential for farming, 9 springs that supply water to my great-grandfather's home.	
PS3A2-18	10 It doesn't take an expert to know that the Giles County area 11 is full of karst topography and water flow through karst can 12 be rapid and very unpredictable, which is a huge concern for 13 me, as far as erosion is concerned. This in itself would 14 cause irreparable harm to the springs and water supplies to 15 my homes, to the local schools and to medical facilities.	
PS3A2-19	16 The disturbance of slopes and mountains and 17 contamination of water on my family's farm, as well as the 18 Newport community, is unacceptable. How can FERC approve 19 this as being safe and without contamination? The 20 2,000-plus page EIS statement issued by FERC has a major	
PS3A2-20	21 concern. MVP stated that there would be a great impact on 22 the national forests. 23 The national forests and Appalachian Trail have 24 major concerns about crossing the AT near Peters Mountain in 25 Giles County, because of the harm to habitat of sensitive	

PS3A2-16 See the response to comment CO59-1 regarding Canoe Cave. The pipeline would be located about 900 feet away from the nearest entrance to Canoe Cave.

PS3A2-17 Springs are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS; vegetation, including trees, in section 4.4. After pipeline installation, crops can be grown over the entire right-of-way.

PS3A2-18 Karst is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS3A2-19 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Construction on steep slopes is discussed in sections 2 and 4.1.

PS3A2-20 The draft EIS concluded there would be a significant impact on forested land not the Jefferson National Forest. Section 4.8 of the EIS discusses the ANST and the Jefferson National Forest. Habitat is discussed in section 4.4; wildlife in 4.5.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 128

PS3A2-20
cont'd 1 and animal species and ecosystems in the national forest.

PS3A2-21 2 The AT has voiced concerns to FERC that MVP would have
3 negative impact on the visual quality of the mountaintop and
4 the recreational experience available to the public on the
5 AT.

PS3A2-22 6 Another major concern is the effects of multiple
7 pipeline crossing the AT and other scenic areas. Why would
8 FERC approve MVP's application to destroy multiple
PS3A2-23 9 forestland, farms, homes, historic buildings and historic
10 communities so private companies can take people's private
11 property for corporate gain. Please listen to the views of
PS3A2-24 12 Ernst Kastning, an authority on karst terrain.
13 The construction of this pipeline through karst
14 terrain is very hazardous, compounded by steep slopes, poor
15 soils and other geohazards. MVP cannot safely build this
PS3A2-25 16 line through our community. Please, FERC, reject this
17 application of MVP to build this land and destroy our
18 heritage in historic Newport, Virginia, Giles County.
19 MS. TRACY: My name is Patricia Tracy. I'm from
PS3A2-26 20 Blacksburg. And what'd I like to say is very brief. This
21 whole process is unbelievably corrupt. It is very clear to
22 us that the FERC always approves pipelines. It's funded by
23 the pipeline companies, supports the pipelines, is
24 authorizing the theft of private property and I call that --
25 and what it's doing to the citizens of this area, their

PS3A2-21 Visual impacts to the ANST are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS3A2-22 Section 4.13 of the EIS provides a discussion of cumulative impacts to the ANST.

PS3A2-23 The MVP would not destroy homes or historic buildings. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS3A2-24 See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PS3A2-25 Historic properties are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A2-26 The FERC is funded by Congress. Part of the Commission's mission is to carry out its obligations under the NGA, including the authorization of new natural gas infrastructure. See the response to comment IND196-5 regarding the FERC review process. Companies seek to negotiate agreements with landowners to acquire their easements. The EIS addressed water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-26
cont'd

1 water, their property, their lives, their health, is in
2 fact, domestic terrorism. Thank you.

3 MR. SCHNEIDER: Hi, good afternoon. My name's
4 Paul Schneider. I'm an engineer for Roanoke Gas Company and

PS3A2-27

5 I wanted to take a minute to explain why I support Mountain
6 Valley Pipeline. I believe that this project will bring
7 additional gas supply to Roanoke and the southwest Virginia
8 region. The area is currently supplied by several natural
9 gas pipelines, which have been operating safely for decades,
10 and a third pipeline would provide opportunity to supply
11 more people and businesses with safe natural gas service.

12 Another reason is for economic development. Many
13 manufacturers in the area currently use natural gas and they
14 are expanding due to the affordability and reliability of
15 that service. And many other manufacturers that are moving
16 to the area want to be able to use natural gas as well.

17 Another reason why I support the project is that
18 it will help diversify energy options for people who live
19 here and that they will be able to use natural gas to heat
20 their homes and the manufacturers that move here will be
21 able to create jobs, direct jobs in their industries, and
22 periphery jobs supporting those industries. And that
23 natural gas, a pipeline is statistically the safest way to
24 transport fossil fuels from their source to use points.

25 And finally, the last reason and most personal

PS3A2-27 Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 reason to me why I support natural gas is because they
2 provide many good jobs. I know many people in the natural
3 gas industry who have worked there for thirty-plus years,
4 their entire careers. And I think this is a good
5 opportunity for folks of all education levels to have good
6 career-long jobs that can't be off-shored or sent somewhere
7 else. Thank you.

PS3A2-28

8 MR. YOLTON: David Yolton. I'm opposed to the
9 pipeline, mainly because of worry about our water sources in
10 Giles County. We have many karst features, sinkholes, caves
11 and that type of thing. Dye tracing has shown that we don't
12 know where all the water goes. The pipeline is proposed to
13 go through many sinkholes and near many caves. We are
14 opposed to that.

PS3A2-29

15 I have a sheet here with scatter-shot thoughts
16 that I picked up from the EIS. I noticed that the wells and
17 springs have not all been located or tested. The pipeline
18 is proposed to go through my property. My well has not been
19 located or tested yet.

PS3A2-30

20 The erosion and sedimentation plan that is
21 supposed to reduce downstream turbidity and sedimentation
22 "should" reduce is not good enough term to use in
23 constructing through such fragile terrain. I believe MVP
24 should adhere to state soil and erosion control, not a
25 special category.

PS3A2-28

The pipeline addresses karst and sinkholes in section 4.1 and water resources in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A2-29

See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending information about water wells.

PS3A2-30

See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. Table 2.4-2 in the draft EIS identified the locations in the docket where soil and erosion control plans can be found.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-31 | 1 The surveys for ten endangered species are not
2 complete. Other surveys are incomplete. We've had numerous
3 surveys on our property. We're given notice, but we don't
4 know exactly when they're gonna come. They wanna come on
5 November 9th and 10th. We do not know the reason for their
6 return trip. It's very unnerving to have a group of
7 strangers to come on your property.

PS3A2-32 | 8 We're opposed to the law that allows them to come
9 on your property without your permission. We are opposed to
10 the prospect of imminent domain by a private corporation for
11 private gain. The karst topography, the Kastning Report

PS3A2-33 | 12 which you all have, is a definitive study, although it's not
13 referred in the EIS, nor refuted. This study concludes that
14 the pipeline, if built where proposed, will cause
15 unmitigable damage. And therefore, the EIS is wrong to
16 state that negative effects can be mitigated. They cannot
17 be mitigated.

18 The inspection of karst morphology is inadequate.
19 Two years is not enough time to determine whether karst
20 topography changes. We have a cave on our property at
21 Milepost 210.4. The EIS says construction does not appear
22 to encounter the cave, so they don't know whether they're
23 encountering the cave.

PS3A2-34 | 24 We're extremely worried about the spillage of
25 diesel, oils and other fluids that would get into the

PS3A2-31 Section 4.7 of the final EIS has been revised to include updated survey information.

PS3A2-32 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PS3A2-33 See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PS3A2-34 See the response to comment CO14-3 regarding spills.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 132

PS3A2-34 cont'd | 1 groundwater. The proposed pipeline goes through historic
PS3A2-35 | 2 properties. They're wrong on the historic properties
| 3 identified. The EIS is incomplete, misleading, inaccurate
| 4 and self-serving, and it's not sufficient for a "go-ahead"
| 5 to construct the pipeline.
| 6 There needs to be a lot more work done and we
| 7 believe that the route that they've chosen is wrong. It's
| 8 not buildable. They've never built a pipeline of this size
| 9 through our area before. We don't trust the procedure. We
| 10 think that FERC is a rigged organization. They're funded by
| 11 pipeline companies, oil and gas companies. They're immune
PS3A2-36 | 12 or seemingly so to political expression. The demand has not
| 13 been proven for the pipeline. The Key-Log economic report
| 14 spells that out quite clearly that the demand is not there.
| 15 The key observation points, the scar will appear along 460
| 16 in Giles County, and we oppose it.
PS3A2-37 | 17 MS CISEK: I am Dawn Cisek, 402 Teele Acres Road,
| 18 and that's Newport. I am here to oppose the pipeline and --
| 19 how it affects my property is that they are taking a 40-foot
| 20 right-of-way, which puts an access road right up against,
| 21 within seven inches of my front porch, and so I would like
| 22 that moved. But more importantly, my spring is gonna be
| 23 affected, that's not on my property, it's on Mr. Jones'
| 24 property, whom you will speak with soon.
| 25 They've made property deals with two of the other

PS3A2-35 Historic properties are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS. There are many existing pipelines in Virginia.

PS3A2-36 See the response to comment IND196-5 regarding the FERC review process. See the response to comment IND137-1 regarding the KeyLog Report.

PS3A2-37 Section 3.5 of the final EIS has been revised to address the concerns of this landowner.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-38 | 1 neighbors who do not own the property where the spring is
2 located, but not -- they haven't spoken with Mr. Jones, and
3 if I lose that spring, I have no water. My house sits on a
PS3A2-39 | 4 limestone cliff. I had to go through a lot of effort to
5 purchase my home, which was built in 1880. It is on the
6 historical district map.

PS3A2-40 | 7 And the only way I could get it was to do water
8 testing, both on the purity of the water and the volume of
9 the water. I have caves on my property. I have a huge
10 sinkhole on my property. If they start getting up there,
11 blasting -- I mean, common sense tells you water's gonna
12 find the closest hole. So I'm very concerned about my
13 water.

PS3A2-41 | 14 I'm very concerned about losing 100-year-old
15 trees and an heirloom flower bed that may not mean anything
16 to anybody else -- it means something to me. I'm very
17 concerned about the division it's causing within our
18 community of people who have sold their property and not
19 sold. Both of my neighbors on either side have sold. It
20 causes a problem. That's their prerogative.

PS3A2-42 | 21 I don't want them taking my property and
22 affecting my way of life. That's my sense of place. It's
23 not just a house. It's not -- I have to have water. And
24 when I asked about the water before, they told me they would
25 bring it in in a stainless-steel tank. I have a spring

PS3A2-38 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A2-39 Historic Districts are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A2-40 Sinkholes are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS3A2-41 Section 2.4.2.13 of the draft EIS stated that Mountain Valley would leave mature trees and landscaping intact where possible.

PS3A2-42 Mountain Valley seeks to negotiate an agreement with you to purchase an easement across your property; which would not be a taking.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 that's been in my deed since 1880. And they're gonna
2 replace it with a stainless-steel tank if my water goes
3 away?

PS3A2-43

4 I don't understand how that can be. I don't
5 understand having a pipeline coming through a historical
6 district, the most populated area of Newport. It's coming
7 right through the town. It's taking my parent's house. I
8 think they just spoke with you. It's taking my parent's
9 house. It's coming close to our, where our children play,
10 where we worship. It's not a good thing.

PS3A2-44

11 It's just not a good thing, there's no good in
12 this at all. And a real concern is, I don't understand how
13 this is considered imminent domain. I understood imminent
14 domain was supposed to be for the benefit of many. This is
15 for a benefit of a rich fuel company. It's not benefiting
16 us in any fashion. And that's all I have to say about that.

17 MS. COFFEY: Mary Beth Coffey. I'm a landowner
18 at Milepost 243.5. How can I begin to respond to this draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement? When the information
20 contained within is incomplete, inadequate and inaccurate.
21 I'll let MVP uncover and convey that missing information to
22 you when you realize the shortcomings outlined in this faux
23 environmental study.

24 Yes, MVP spokeswoman Natalie Cox said the draft
25 was just that, a draft, and that we should accept gaps in

PS3A2-43

Historic Districts are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. See the response to comment PS3B1-38 regarding removal of homes for the MVP.

PS3A2-44

See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. The Commission would consider the benefits of the projects.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 information. How can we be expected to voice concerns that
2 are valid, but do not present because information is
3 lacking?

PS3A2-45

4 I would, however, like to respond to some of the
5 slipshod, careless, random and sketchy information that has
6 been printed. All of the pristine Bent Mountain plateau is
7 wetlands. The proposed pipeline would dog-leg through
8 wetlands anywhere on the mountain. As a resident and
9 frequent hiker on the mountain, I know these things.

10 As a matter of fact, MVP requests siting the
11 pipeline closer than 15 yards when paralleling certain
12 waterbodies. Even FERC uses the delineation "not acceptable
13 for pipelines being wider than acceptable right-of-way in
14 some wetlands", which is yet another unacceptable proposal
15 by MVP.

PS3A2-46

16 MVP merely mentions in Table 4.1, 1-10, that
17 there are 4.3 miles of high incidence susceptibility to
18 landslides in Roanoke County. Yet there are no milepost
19 designations noted on the table as having areas of landslide
20 concern. This is an error of contradiction that must be
21 corrected.

PS3A2-47

22 Incomplete, also, is the recommended
23 identification of all private, domestic water supply wells
24 within 150 feet of the construction work areas. FERC highly
25 "recommends" this assessment. A recommendation is

PS3A2-45

See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS. The draft EIS was based on surveys of about 90 percent of the route; so data gaps were minimal. The final EIS updated information that may have been missing from the draft. Bent Mountain is not pristine. It includes existing infrastructure such as towns, housing tracts, churches, schools, commercial developments, roads, and powerlines. Wetlands and waterbodies are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-46

Table 4.1.1-10 provides a summary of the number of miles that would cross areas susceptible to landslides. No mileposts are provided in the table.

PS3A2-47

See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending information about water wells. See the response to IND147-1 regarding FERC staff recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-47
cont'd

1 inadequate. And such identification should be required as
2 all of the Bent Mountain residents, as well as many along
3 the proposed pipeline path have private, natural water
4 supplies.

PS3A2-48

5 The impacts on Bottom Creek, as well as the
6 Spring Hollow reservoir, if this projected pipeline
7 construction is approved, will have dire consequences on any
8 and all living organisms unfortunate enough to be within its
9 polluting commands.

10 The conclusions here are that the proposed
11 pipeline project will be in solid violation of the Clean
12 Water Act, and most importantly there will most certainly be
13 long-term negative impacts on our waters. Water is life.

14 MR. DUDLEY: I'm Alden Dudley. I live here in
15 southwest Roanoke County. I'm 79-year-old retired
16 physician. I ran the laboratories in hospitals.
17 Ironically, my dad worked for Mobil Oil from 1931 to '72 and
18 was the person assigned to determine where the Colonial
19 pipeline would go, from Houston, Texas up to Linden, New
20 Jersey.

21 Sadly, that line is now 55-60 years old and is
22 beginning to blow up every month or so. And so I've had a
23 friendly awareness of pipelines and my three and a half
24 acres happen to have an 8" East Tennessee gas line going
25 across the back. I bought that without any real concern

PS3A2-48

Bottom Creek and Spring Hollow Reservoir are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

137

1 because it was a small pipe and I thought everything would
2 be fine.

3 Sadly I've learned, since the invasion of
4 Mountain Valley Pipeline, about the hazards that they
5 create. And the Trans-Alaska Pipeline is now leaking 500
6 times a year. They record about forty, because they don't
7 record them unless it's more than a barrel.

8 When you have crude oil kind of spittin' and
9 sputterin' through a pinhole, it takes a long time for a
10 barrel to come out. The snow turns black and they can see
11 it and repair it before it gets to that size, so 90% of 'em
12 don't ever get recorded as a leak.

13 It's an indication, however, that certainly the
14 age of the pipeline is going to allow corrosion to create
15 many, many, many pinholes, hundreds and actually thousands.
16 And when you're talking natural gas, under a high pressure
17 and get a pinhole, it's a totally different story. It's
18 gonna come blasting through that hole and enlarge that hole
19 and become a calamity very quickly.

20 I regret that not many people are alive and old
21 enough to remember the natural gas explosion in Cleveland,
22 Ohio, in 1944. At that time, natural gas was stored in
23 tanks aboveground, like the tank farms that we see around
24 this area for the trucks to drive up to. One of the tanks
25 developed a leak around the well the natural gas came out.

PS3A2-49

PS3A2-49

The MVP pipeline would transport natural gas in a vapor state; not oil. The 1944 Cleveland incident involved LNG in storage tanks; again very different from a modern buried welded steel transportation pipeline. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. As stated in section 4.12 of the EIS, in accordance with DOT regulations, the proposed facilities would be regularly inspected for leakage and potential pipeline hazards such as construction activity, encroachments, and evidence of recent unmonitored excavations as part of scheduled operations and maintenance.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

138

1 It was cold so it went down to the ground, it found a sewer,
2 went into the sewer, mixed with the gases in the sewer and
3 then boom, there was an explosion blowing manhole covers off
4 and they went as far as two miles away.

5 When the fire got back to the tank farm, it blew
6 the adjoining tank up after several minutes, killing a bunch
7 of people then. And that set off tanks 3 and 4.
8 Fortunately, it was on Lake Erie, so half of the power went
9 out over Lake Erie. The other half totally destroyed a
10 square mile of the city of Cleveland, taking out seventy
11 houses, two factories, killing 200 people, leaving 600
12 people homeless, and the flash burns that went beyond that
13 mile decimated all kinds of people and animals for quite
14 some distance.

15 The calculated the power of that blast with an
16 equivalent to one-sixth of the Nagasaki atomic bomb. And if
17 you go on and create a utility corridor, one pipeline is
18 gonna be calamitous enough. If you put Transco, who's
19 already talking about co-laying a pipe with MVP, now, and if
20 you have two pipes together, of course it's gonna be much
21 worse.

22 Appomattox had a 30" pipe blow and it made a hole
23 20 feet deep and 1,200 feet across. And that was eight
24 years ago here in Virginia. When one of these pipes blows,
25 it's gonna be 40 feet deep, half mile in diameter. For the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 hole, all of that debris coming down somewhere, and then of
2 course, the flash is going to set the forest ablaze for well
3 over a mile in all directions.

4 The number of casualties is gonna be huge, just
5 huge. And if it's near something like Smith Mountain Lake
6 and the pipeline goes within two miles of the lake, it can
7 blow out the dam, Leesville Lake dam, as well, others along
8 the path. And the flooding, of course, is gonna be marked.

PS3A2-50

9 There is no way we will be able to get any profit
10 from this pipeline passing through here to sell gas
11 privately to Europe and India that will begin to pay for
12 those kinds of expenses. And knowing that this can happen,
13 the people that support it will be held accountable and you
14 will see lawsuits as happened in California with the San
15 Bruno fire, plus it's coming after the public officials, the
16 commissions, everybody else to help recover the damages.
17 And I don't think you want that. You really don't want
18 that. Thank you very much.

PS3A2-50

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3A2-51

19 MS. AUSTIN: Robin Austin. I'm talking to this
20 from a personal level. It appears that our driveway, which
21 is a shared driveway wants to be used as an access road.
22 And I don't have any idea if any surveys have been done
23 actually about what is along that road. We have a vernal
24 pool, which I don't know if you know what a vernal pool is,
25 but the vernal pool supports indicator species of water

PS3A2-51

If approved, the commentor would be impacted by access road MVP-RO-285. As provided in appendix E, MPV-RO-285 would be a temporary access road which would be restored following construction. The statements regarding a vernal pool are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-51 | 1 quality and this is the only place these species can
cont'd | 2 breathe. This is something I got off the internet. This is
3 water from our vernal pool.

PS3A2-52 | 4 Also right there along the driveway, we have
5 showy orchis, which is a native orchid, that we don't have
6 everywhere, but it's very special to me, even though it is
7 in Virginia. This is foliage from where the plant has
8 already died back. And like I say, I don't know if anything
9 has been done as far as a survey of anything along this
10 driveway.

PS3A2-53 | 11 We host every year a hummingbird event. It's
12 attended very strongly by members of the whole community,
13 not just people on the mountain, but from everywhere. This
14 is the one we did in 2012 where one of the people created
15 this card for us as a thank you note, and as you can see, it
16 showed bird feeders with many hummingbirds. We've had
17 people come and actually record video, and there are
18 estimates that we have at least 100 hummingbirds, at least.
19 We feed a gallon and a half of sugar water every year
20 between mid-July and mid-August and again, you know, it's
21 the habitat, not just our little spot, but all around us
22 that contributes to this.

PS3A2-54 | 23 So these are some of the things that I don't
24 think that have been addressed. Also, we do have a well and
25 a septic. And I don't know how much an access road would

PS3A2-52 Section 2.4.2.13 of the draft EIS stated that Mountain Valley would leave landscaping intact where possible. Restoration of landscaping can be negotiated as part of an easement agreement.

PS3A2-53 The statements regarding hummingbirds are noted.

PS3A2-54 Water resources, including wells, are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment PS1B1-10 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-54
cont'd

1 impact us, but it could. We are very close to the blast
2 zone. The pipeline crosses the road that we travel to and
3 from to get to our home. It's going on the property that
4 borders us. It's going along the edge of that. And then
5 along the property behind us, so we're kind of surrounded by
6 these pieces of the pipeline route.

7 I've been walking the pipeline with some of your
8 surveyors. I've been on the property behind our house
9 because the lady who had that property is not real
10 comfortable in trying to communicate with the people of the
11 pipeline. So we've been back there and I've been able to
12 see things that I wouldn't've gotten to see.

PS3A2-55

13 One thing was a cemetery that has a person who
14 was born in 1861 and died in 1899. That's within 400 meters
15 of the center line. That's what the archeologist plotted
16 out. It's just been very interesting to find what we do
17 have in our community and a lot of this, literally in my
18 backyard that I didn't even know about. So I don't know how
19 much the surveyors have been there to see what is there,
20 which is a concern of mine. That's probably my biggest
21 concern right now.

PS3A2-56

22 But as I say, you know, I don't agree with the
23 pipeline for the reasons of everybody else. I don't see the
24 need. I don't agree with fracking. That's just not
25 something I think is the right thing to do. And those are

PS3A2-55

Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3A2-56

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016

142

1 my biggest concerns that I wanted to bring forth at this
2 time. I've been doing comments on the site regularly.

3 MS. RIVES: My name is Mary Rives. What I want
4 to say is that the water here is very important. So that's
5 the crux of what I'm gonna talk about. The DEIS is so
6 incomplete that I don't understand how MVP could even submit
7 it. I feel like this meeting and this request for input is
8 way too early in the process. We should be reviewing a
9 draft that contains most, if not all of the information.

10 So now MVP is asking us to edit their report,
11 write their report for 'em. I feel that's terribly wrong,
12 and therefore, my comments are not gonna be very specific,
13 because I'm not gonna write their report for 'em. So just
14 take it from this that I have an advanced degree and I can't
15 even make sense out of the report. So I only have reviewed
16 part of the report because it's so thick, didn't have enough
17 time, since I do have a life, that I only have addressed and
18 looked at the part that has directly to do with my
19 household.

20 The thing that concerns me is the water. And
21 there are so many points that need to be made around the
22 whole gamut of issues, that I don't have time to talk about
23 'em, but with three minutes, I can talk about the water.
24 Reference specifically Page 4-90. That's the area that
25 talks about Bottom Creek, where I live, and the report.

PS3A2-57

PS3A2-57

The draft EIS was prepared by the FERC not Mountain Valley. See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The final EIS, that revised the draft, was also produced by FERC staff, our contractor, and cooperating agencies; not Mountain Valley.

PS3A2-58

PS3A2-58

See the response to comment FA11-17 regarding Bottom Creek. Loss of stream bank cover, including temperature changes, is discussed in section 4.6.2 of the EIS.