

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-58
cont'd

1 Bottom Creek is the only Tier 3 stream that is
2 downstream from the MVP anywhere along the route. It's
3 noted in the report by MVP. And MVP states that they plan
4 to minimize any impact on the watershed. There should be no
5 impact on a Tier 3 stream, period. So cutting down the tree
6 canopies, coming over the mountain is going to--and it's
7 three miles, according to the report--that it parallels the
8 tributaries to Bottom Creek.

9 Cutting down the tree canopies can heat the
10 waters and ruin a Tier 3 stream. 160 acres are planned to
11 be deforested in the area. 160 acres of trees merely cut
12 down. It's going to heat the waters, it's gonna ruin that
13 stream. I live on a plateau. It's all wetlands. I have a
14 field, it's all wet. That water is what goes through the
15 sediment, through the rocks, down the mountain and is
16 everybody's drinking water around here.

PS3A2-59

17 You're getting ready to ruin the whole Roanoke
18 Valley. The potential is there, and I don't like that
19 potential. So I think the blasting and trenching on Poor
20 Mountain and Bent Mountain is gonna kill all the plants, the
21 animals and subsequently the people on the mountain and
22 those down below.

23 This report states the impact will be temporary.
24 However, changes to the land will increase the water
25 temperature and sedimentation, which will cause permanent

PS3A2-59

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.
See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-59
cont'd

1 impacts on a Tier 3 stream. This is a violation of the
2 anti-degradation policy, Section 316(a) of the Clean Water
3 Act.

4 MS. SAVAGE: My name is Virginia Savage. I
5 reside in Salem, Virginia, and I own property in Craig
6 County, Virginia, known as Upper West Craig Valley. That
7 123 acres in Craig is under conservation easement. I am
8 opposed to the Mountain Valley Pipeline project due to many
9 reasons, but there are two that I will address now, due to
10 time constraints.

PS3A2-60

11 One is about Figure 4.13-1 in the draft
12 Environmental Impact Statement. One notes with interest
13 that the localities are referred to, not by County names,
14 but by the watersheds they lie within. And my property lies
15 in a watershed I feel will be greatly impacted by this
16 project. Karst topography will not mix well with a
17 five-foot trench dug in the ground, and especially where it
18 crosses creeks and streams of all sizes.

19 I was told by an MVP engineer that they have no
20 experience in dealing with karst. Yikes. I'm especially
21 fearful that crossing Craig Creek upstream from my property
22 will A) ruin my water, B) shift the creek so that repairing
23 and buffers change, C) damage local aquifers which provide
24 drinking water to our communities, or D) all of the above.

25 The other thing I would like to address is a

PS3A2-60

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Waterbody crossing methods are discussed in section 2 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1. The pipeline would be buried beneath the waterbody and the contour of the crossing would not change.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

145

PS3A2-61

1 sense of place that we have. My property has been in my
2 family all of my life. We choose to live there part of the
3 year because we love the place so much. It is now in the
4 third generation and the love of this land is so compelling
5 that it is almost indescribable.

6 To think that our viewsheds will be decimated by
7 a 50- or now we learned, and God forbid, a 500-foot corridor
8 is heart wrenching. To see the mountains, this thing must
9 transverse. One knows that there is no way to protect the
10 landscape from horrible erosion and damage that cannot be
11 mitigated. I urge FERC to disallow this project for those
12 two reasons, among the many others expressed in these
13 hearings. Thank you.

14 MR. ZOECKLEIN: My name is Bruce Zoecklein. This
15 DEIS review I read extensively and found to be superficial
16 and quite frankly, somewhat ridiculous. Additionally, I
17 only looked at the impact of the immediate route, not the
18 region, not the cost to the rest of us in Virginia or my
19 community.

PS3A2-62

20 There's been several studies that suggest that
21 this pipeline could cost our community or our region three-,
22 three-quarters of a billion dollars annually, and that would
23 be a loss to us. Creating a clear, cut corridor across the
24 headwaters and streams will send excess sediment into
25 streams and underground water sources affecting millions.

PS3A2-61

Visual resources are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding a 50-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS3A2-62

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment IND137-1 regarding the KeyLog report. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		146
PS3A2-63	1 The proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline covers 2 fifty-three miles of karst land, that is to say caves and 3 sinkholes on the whole land. One of the countries' leading 4 experts in this kind of soil has written FERC and reported 5 that this pipeline cannot safely be built due to the 6 unstable nature of the soil and a 20% mountain grade that 7 this pipeline is purported to cover, yet that apparently was 8 ignored in this DEIS report.	
PS3A2-64	9 The route goes through Giles County, directly 10 over the maximum seismic zone that's ever been recorded in 11 Virginia. The largest earthquake in Virginia is right 12 underneath where this route is proposed. The DEIS did not 13 consider that, nor does it consider the greenhouse gas PS3A2-65 14 emissions that are produced from the time this stuff is 15 fracked out of the ground to burning.	
PS3A2-66	16 There are federally protected species which will 17 be affected, but that doesn't seem to matter. It wasn't a 18 point of concern in this report. Mountain Valley's latest PS3A2-67 19 plan is to create a 500-foot wide utility corridor through 20 the Jefferson Forest, which quite frankly, anybody in this 21 region would consider absurd. They have not bothered to PS3A2-68 22 evaluate the Hybrid Alternative 1A, which we were told is 23 required by law and wasn't even discussed in the DEIS.	
PS3A2-69	24 There are eight historic districts affected in 25 Virginia that were also not covered in this DEIS. FERC's	

PS3A2-63 See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PS3A2-64 The Giles County Seismic Zone is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A2-65 GHGs and climate change are addressed in section 4.13 of the EIS. No fracking is involved with these projects. See also the response to comment FA15-10 regarding lifecycle emissions.

PS3A2-66 Endangered species are discussed in section 4.7.

PS3A2-67 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PS3A2-68 Section 3 of the EIS has been revised to provide a discussion of the Hybrid 1A Alternative route.

PS3A2-69 Historic Districts are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 function appears to be exclusively for the benefit of the
2 gas and oil industry and totally, completely disregarding
3 the concerns of citizens. The FERC response to the draft
4 environmental review, stating that the impacts were limited,
5 despite independent scientific statements suggesting the
6 opposite are quite frankly, ridiculous.

PS3A2-70

7 Quite frankly, this agency needs to be stopped.
8 There's nothing American about taking citizens' land against
9 their will for a private for-profit company. Property
10 rights are about human dignity. I don't know how you guys
11 work for this agency, quite frankly, but that's your issue.

12 MR. HABER: My name is Justin Haber. I am
13 currently located in Blacksburg, Virginia. I'm a student at
14 Virginia Tech. I'm currently a senior studying biological

PS3A2-71

15 systems, engineering and environmental science. And I have
16 a lot of concerns about the Mountain Valley Pipeline
17 crossing through the Jefferson National Forest.

18 With my background in soil science and ecology, I
19 believe that the construction that is going to occur through
20 there will destroy any kind of micro-organism that's living
21 in there because I believe that if there's a leakage, you
22 know, which occurs very often, I think that it's really
23 toxic to the microbes in the soil and I believe this will
24 also impact hydrology in the constructed area.

25 Whenever you're moving soils around -- gosh, I'm

PS3A2-70

The FERC carries out its responsibilities in accordance with the NGA. If landowners reach agreements with the companies for the purchase of easements, no private land would be taken. Property rights were discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3A2-71

See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks. Soils are addressed in section 4.2 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

148

PS3A2-72

1 losing my train of thought. Anyways, there's a potential
2 for an explosion at compressor stations and I really don't
3 want that to happen. I think that the areas that you're
4 putting them in are located around places that you think the
5 people don't have that much of a say, but anyways.

6 If we want to move towards a clean energy future,
7 we can't be putting oil infrastructure into the ground and
8 investing in that kind of thing, so that's all I gotta say.
9 Thanks.

10 MR. GITTELMAN: My name is Samuel Gittelman. I
11 am a lifelong Virginian and a current student at Virginia
12 Tech, studying environmental policy and planning, where
13 every day I sit and learn about the intense responsibility
14 of environmental policy-makers and enforcers like FERC to
15 hold fast to their explicit commitment to preserving this
16 commonwealth's air, land and water quality for these and
17 future generations.

PS3A2-73

18 These pipelines benefit a rich and loud minority,
19 namely EQT, NextEra and Dominion, another fossil fuel
20 interest, at the expense of countless Virginians, from its
21 taxpayers, landowners, endangered species and others like me
22 who have enjoyed the timeless untouched beauty that exists
23 in Virginia, like that of the 500 miles of the Appalachian
24 Trail, which will be crossed literally and figuratively by
25 this intensely destructive and unnecessary pipeline project.

PS3A2-72

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Renewable energy alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy.

PS3A2-73

See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. The EIS concluded that for most resources there would not be significant adverse effects.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

149

1 I'm calling on this estranged body of so-called
2 experts to listen to the will of the bodies whose
3 livelihoods are at stake because of this project, instead of
4 these fossil fuel interests. This project exemplifies all
5 that is flawed with our bought-out bureaucracies, so we're
6 here again to call you FERC commissioners out to either act
7 or be vilified. Now is the time to choose which side of
8 history you will rest on.

9 I can't believe, as a student of environmental
10 policy and planning, that this is the body that I have to
11 look up to as a career prospect, where they're basically
12 undoing all the things that I've learned that as a
13 policymaker related to environmental protection I should be
14 working towards and striving to.

15 This cannot stand. We have to have a regulatory
16 commission that acts on behalf of the environmental
17 interests and not fossil fuels' interests and the monetary
18 interests. This cannot stand, once again. Thank you.

19 MS. BELLEVILLE: I am Laura Belleville, and I'm
20 with the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. I'm the director of
21 conservation. I'm gonna focus on a few areas of concern.
22 Mostly I think as a preliminary comment on the draft
23 Environmental Impact Statement, we are actually continuing
24 to review it now, and we'll issue written comments from my
25 organization, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. Let me

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

150

1 just jump in.

PS3A2-74

2 So our first area of concern is the lack of
3 visual assessment with regard to the Appalachian National
4 Scenic Trail. The proposed route would require 500-foot
5 corridors around the pipeline, eliminating thousands of
6 acres of forest and producing prominent scars visible from
7 potentially 20 miles away from many locations along the
8 trail.

9 Several of the iconic viewpoints in Virginia will
10 be negatively impacted, including place names, overlooks,
11 Angel's Rest, Rice Fields, Dragon's Tooth. Visual
12 simulations are needed to sufficiently determine the impact
13 to the AT scenic resources. The Commission admitted to
14 having insufficient coordination among relevant stakeholders
15 with regard to the visual assessments. And the DEIS maps
16 that include the center line of the AT on Peters Mountain
17 are inaccurate.

18 Our requested action is that the ATC, the
19 Appalachian Trail Conservancy, request that a substantive
20 response to our comments be provided and incorporated into
21 our supplemental EIS. That includes visual impact
22 simulations and comparisons. This supplemental EIS should
23 be available for the ATC and the public to review and
24 comment on prior to the final EIS.

PS3A2-75

25 We also feel there has been incomplete

PS3A2-74

The final EIS was revised to discuss the VIA for the ANST in section 4.8.

PS3A2-75

The final EIS addresses the comments of the ATC on the draft. Alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-75
cont'd

1 alternative analysis, primarily the proposed half of the
2 pipeline passing through dozens of miles of scenic and
3 unbroken forest landscaping, ignoring potential routes that
4 have already been impacted by development, and although the
5 DEIS offers an analysis of two alternative locations to
6 cross the AT, both were dismissed without any visual
7 simulations offered for comparison with the proposed
8 pipeline route.

9 Our requested action -- the ATC requested in more
10 detail the assessment of these alternative locations be
11 conducted, including scenic resource impact comparisons and
12 available for review before the final EIS.

PS3A2-76

13 One of our most significant concerns at this
14 point, as we review the DEIS, is the weakening of the
15 current forest service policy for AT protection. The DEIS
16 would require amendments to the Jefferson National Forest
17 Plan, the foundational document for forest management.
18 These amendments would not only be unprecedented, but would
19 significantly erode the value of the AT, which the public
20 has spent millions of dollars to protect.

21 Proposed Amendment 4 is of significant concern to
22 the ATC. This amendment would change the scenery integrity
23 objective for the AT prescription area from a high to
24 moderate, downgrading the standard for scenic integrity
25 along the trail in this area. This amendment also allows 5

PS3A2-76 See the response to comment FA10-1 regarding Amendment 4.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-76
cont'd | 1 to 10 years following completion of the project for this SIO
2 of moderate to be achieved. This implies that the scenic
3 integrity will be below moderate for up to a decade.

PS3A2-77 | 4 Requested actions. The DEIS should be revised to
5 adequately address the potential environmental impact of the
6 current proposed route, and alternative routes must be
7 considered. Any forest plan standard that would not be met
8 by any aspect of the proposed project must be identified in
9 a supplemental DEIS and the public must be afforded a
10 minimum of 90 days to assess and comment.

11 MS. PETTIPIECE: My name is Teri Pettipiece. I'm
12 concerned about the pipeline being built at all, but mostly
13 as it goes across some property that we own in Giles County.

PS3A2-78 | 14 I think it's around Marker 215. This property's been in our
15 family since the late 1700s and passed down. And the
16 property that's adjoining mine -- there's a spring that is
17 the only water source for several of the families that are
18 neighboring around there.

19 And there are sinkholes and caves around in that
20 area. Lots of landmarks and structures were not included in
21 the MVP DEIS and we had originally planned to build on that
22 property. We've perked in two different areas to plan for
23 that, and then we heard of the pipeline coming through and
24 had to stop that, because then it wouldn't be safe to build
25 where there's a pipeline. And I heard people speaking prior

PS3A2-77 The proposed route is discussed in section 2 and impacts and proposed mitigation are provide in section 4 of the EIS. Alternatives are discussed in section 3 of the EIS. The LMRP amendments were identified in the draft EIS, which was available for a 90-day public comment period. Although the LRMP amendments in the final EIS are different, they address essentially the same resource concerns as in the draft EIS.

PS3A2-78 The EIS provides a discussion of caves, sinkholes, and karst in section 4.1; water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-78
cont'd

1 to this about the Appalachian Trail being affected
2 negatively because of it.
3 The karst that are in the area make it unsafe,
4 and building a pipeline over the mountains, in addition,
5 would make that a very unsafe place to put a pipeline.
6 Although I currently don't live on the property, there are
7 neighbors around, and we had hoped to build and live there,
8 and I just don't feel like it's a safe place to put it.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. PITT: Donna Pitt. I'm a landowner in Giles
11 County and a registered intervenor. I have read your draft
12 impact statement and everyone of MVP's submissions. I find
13 what your staff is concluded in this DEIS, and especially
14 its conclusions, utterly incredulous and completely
15 disingenuous.

PS3A2-79

16 You take MVP's incomplete and constantly data
17 submissions as accurate and complete, and then make sweeping
18 conclusions that any damage to the national forest, the
19 Appalachian Trail and thousands of acres of private lands
20 will be limited, temporary or mitigable. How shockingly
21 ignorant of you.

PS3A2-80

22 You have ignored thousands of public comments
23 from professionals, from your own in MVP's subcontractors,
24 to the effect that the alternate route 200 is unbuildable.
25 You have ignored the professional conclusion of the region's

PS3A2-79 See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS. The Jefferson National Forest and the ANST are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS. All of our conclusions are backed by facts.

PS3A2-80 See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-80
cont'd
1 most prominent geological engineer, Dr. Kastning, ignoring
2 his conclusion that the region is a no-build zone for a gas
3 pipeline of this size.

PS3A2-81
4 You have allowed MVP to claim they can stabilize
5 slip-prone soils, trench through sinking streams without
6 destroying groundwater channels, fill in swales and
7 sinkholes which affects groundwater recharge areas, all
8 without the data to substantiate these claims. You have

PS3A2-82
9 wrongly allowed MVP to claim there is a need for their gas
10 since they have buyers for that gas, but you have ignored
11 increasingly substantiated data that proves that the gas is
12 not needed by the population it purports to serve.

13 For Virginia and the Carolinas, the anticipated
14 natural gas supply capacity on existing and upgraded
15 infrastructure is sufficient to meet maximum natural gas
16 demand through 2030. Thus, you do not meet the NEPA
17 requirement to establish the need for this project.

PS3A2-83
18 You've proposed a 500-foot utility corridor to be
19 introduced to the Land & Resource Management plan of the
20 national forest, in blatant disregard for the mission of the
21 U.S. Forest Service to preserve and steward our national
22 forests.

23 How dare you attempt to desecrate old-growth
24 forest, lay waste to wetlands and ask to despoil vistas from
25 our trails.

PS3A2-81 The EIS provides a discussion and analysis of soils in section 4.2, sinkholes in section 4.1, and groundwater in section 4.3.

PS3A2-82 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS3A2-83 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor on Jefferson National Forest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-84 1 Lastly, you fail in your duty as a federal agency
2 to share with the public the environmental impacts that
3 would significantly affect the region. You are allowing MVP
4 to continue submitting data after the DEIS. There are
5 countless examples of the comment prior to construction,
6 which allows MVP to avoid public comment.

PS3A2-85 7 You are failing in the EPA's requirement that you
8 quantify the total greenhouse gas emissions, upstream and
9 downstream. This DEIS is incomplete, inaccurate and totally
10 inadequate. It fails to meet the standards set by NEPA. It
11 should be reissued after all data has been provided, and the
12 public given an opportunity to comment. Or just pick the
13 "no" option.

PS3A2-86 14 MS. SMITH: My name is Amelia Smith, and I just
15 wanted to voice my concern and opposition to the Mountain
16 Valley Pipeline today. I am concerned primarily with the
17 fact that EQT is not a state utility or a federal utility
18 and therefore the seizure of private land for its gain is,
19 in my opinion, inappropriate and unAmerican.

PS3A2-87 20 Mountain Valley Pipeline has provided incomplete
21 information as far as their draft Environmental Impact
22 Statement. And I don't think that the DEIS should be
23 submitted until they have stipulated their exact terms of
24 remediation and mitigation and moreover, just the
25 information that they have provided for their environmental

PS3A2-84 The EIS discloses to the public the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed construction and operation of the projects; in accordance with NEPA. The final EIS updates the draft with newly filed supplemental information. See the response to comment IND196-2 regarding the prior to construction recommendations.

PS3A2-85 GHGs and climate change are addressed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See also the response to comment FA15-10 regarding lifecycle emissions.

PS3A2-86 The companies seek to negotiate agreements with private landowners to purchase their easements.

PS3A2-87 See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-87
cont'd

1 impact.

PS3A2-88

2 I would like to encourage the FERC to strongly
3 consider a "no-build" option. That was not clear in the
4 draft Environmental Impact Statement. Another concern that

PS3A2-89

5 I have is for the corridor and its mitigation. I believe
6 that MVP did not provide suitable information for the
7 maintenance of the pipeline once it is put in, and there
8 needs to be a long-term plan for what will happen when it is
9 out of commission.

10 I'm a student at Virginia Tech, and while I don't
11 own land right now, I am heavily invested in the community
12 of Blacksburg and southwestern Virginia and I believe that,
13 although I can't speak to the exact perspective of being an
14 affected landowner, I am invested in my country's future,
15 and I think that I should have a say in this whole
16 situation, no matter if I stay in the area or I move on.
17 This is my country, this is my state, this is my future and
18 I believe I should have a stake in it. I don't think that
19 fossil fuel infrastructure is a suitable future.

PS3A2-90

20 MS. DAYSTAR: My name is Elisabeth Daystar. This
21 draft EIS is incredibly insufficient and needs to be tossed,
22 thrown out and you should just start over and do it for real
23 this time. There should be no construction unless you can
24 prove that you can drill the 600-foot tunnel below the
25 Appalachian Trail and prove it to be stable and not ruining

PS3A2-88

The No-Action Alternative is discussed in section 3.

PS3A2-89

Operation and maintenance of the MVP is discussed in section 2.6 of the EIS. 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.

PS3A2-90

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the EIS. The ANST is discussed in both section 3 and 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-90
cont'd | 1 the viewshed as well.

PS3A2-91 | 2 Number two. The pipeline should never go through
3 any part of the Brush Mountain roadless area. With the
4 electric transmission lines already in place there, adding
5 the pipeline would significantly increase forest
6 fragmentation, causing irreparable damage due to both
7 erosion and the invasion of invasive plant species, which
8 would overtake the very forest we are trying to preserve
9 there. You will never be able to get 'em back out.

PS3A2-92 | 10 With the threats always present for leaks, this
11 and all pipelines are just time bombs waiting to leak,
12 explode and destroy our waters through erosion, sediment and
13 through pollutants. This pipeline is crossing far too many

PS3A2-93 | 14 streams and going too near to others, and going underneath
15 too many. Yet, as in the case of the Greenbrier River, not
16 far enough under the Greenbrier River. Your study was
17 terribly flawed due to bad math.

PS3A2-94 | 18 It is illegal in Virginia to take personal
19 property by eminent domain unless there is a proven need
20 for what is being done. Studies such as the Synapse Report
21 have shown that there was not the need for this pipeline,
22 not for the general public. We believe the studies,
23 conclusions and consider what you are doing to be illegal.

24 Since you don't have the means to do this in a
25 good way, I suggest you just can it and look for other ways

PS3A2-91 The POD contains an Exotic and Invasive Species Control Plan in appendix R.

PS3A2-92 See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS3A2-93 Stream crossings are discussed in section 4.3.

PS3A2-94 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

158

1 to make your millions. Thank you.

PS3A2-95

2 MS. IRWIN: Earle Irwin. A honeycomb of caves
3 lays beneath my home and acreage in rural Montgomery County,
4 Virginia, near the proposed pathway of the pipeline. The
5 creek bed that traverses the property is dry, although
6 old-timers say it was once a bold stream surging from a cave
7 higher on the mountain.

8 The wells that have been drilled in our
9 subdivision have drained the aquifer. This is but one small
10 example of one threat that the construction of a pipeline
11 poses to our karst topography. As the Kastning Report
12 submitted to FERC July 2016 supports the complicated
13 labyrinth of underground caves and aquifers, the inflow and
14 outflow of water cannot be accurately mapped.

15 Constructing anything in this region of karst
16 carries risks in something as massive as the excavation
17 where a 42" pipeline will cause incalculable disruptions to
18 our water system. The dangers have been well-documented in
19 the Kastning Report, but have been largely ignored or
20 minimized by MVP and so far by FERC. In addition, the

PS3A2-96

21 region is one of unstable mountain slopes, some of them
22 already demonstrating a history of landslides and
23 irreparable erosion.

24 An engineering feat, like the one proposed to
25 take MVP up, down and across our mountains, has never been

PS3A2-95

Caves are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS; water resources in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PS3A2-96

Landslides and steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND 70-1 regarding erosion. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch pipelines in mountainous terrain. 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

159

PS3A2-96
cont'd

1 attempted or tested. With unstable topography and the
2 ever-present danger of seismic activity in this region,
3 results could be catastrophic. At a minimum, such
4 construction will breach the integrity of our ecosystem with
5 unavoidable erosion and sedimentation, further fouling our
6 waters, the waters of the United States.

7 And then what? Once our ground water system is
8 polluted with sediment or the toxic chemicals used during
9 construction, where will our citizens get the fresh water we
10 need to exist? And just as important, what will happen to
11 the forests, streams, wetlands, endangered plants and
12 animals?

PS3A2-97

13 The DEIS ignores or minimizes the dangers.
14 Credible scientists such as Ernest Kastning have addressed
15 the threats and found them real. Thus, I am adding my
16 appeal to the thousands already calling for FERC to examine
17 the scientific data and acknowledge the reality of the hard
18 science which clearly supports the environmental
19 infeasibility of the MVP.

20 MS. JOHNSON: My name is Robert C. Johnson. I
21 live on Bent Mountain, Virginia, and I'm an intervenor. And
22 I am former teacher with a background in research and
23 editing. My husband, Robert, and I have prepared eight
24 pages of detailed review notes of the DEIS through Section
25 4.3, which I will submit to you today.

PS3A2-97

See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-98

1 The following two footnotes occur throughout and
2 apply to a sensitive watershed in Roanoke County, Virginia.
3 First, Tier 3 is the designation in Virginia for exceptional
4 state waters. Known as outstanding national resource waters
5 for the EPA. There are only thirty in Virginia and the
6 Bottom Creek segment meets all three criteria for
7 identification: Exceptional environmental setting,
8 recreational opportunities and aquatic communities. If
9 Bottom Creek's watershed is degraded, the Tier 3 portion
10 will be degraded as well.

PS3A2-99

11 Second footnote. Virginia Water Quality
12 Standards 9 VAC 25-260-450 designates Bottom Creek from its
13 confluence with the south fork of the Roanoke River
14 upstream, including all named and unnamed tributaries as
15 Class 2 Wild Natural Trout Streams, whose quality under the
16 Clean Water Act shall be maintained and protected to prevent
17 permanent or long-term degradation or impairment. See
18 Virginia Anti DEQ Policy 9 VAC 25-260-30.

19 In our notes, under Surface Water Use
20 Classifications, Page 490, it is recognized that Bottom
21 Creek and Montgomery County, Virginia is the only Tier 3
22 water body that is downstream from the Mountain Valley
23 Pipeline anywhere along the proposed 300-mile corridor. The
24 DEIS states that the MVP would cross Bottom Creek in Roanoke
25 County about three miles from the Tier 3 segment and not

PS3A2-98

See the response to comment FA11-17 regarding Bottom Creek.

PS3A2-99

See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. 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. The EIS provides a discussion of wetlands in section 3.3 and endangered species in section 4.7. We disagree that the upper regions of Bottom Creek should be considered impaired until data proves otherwise.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

161

PS3A2-99
cont'd

1 along the impaired segment. And further states that impacts
2 to the wild natural trout streams in its watershed would be
3 minimized or avoided.

4 What has been minimized here is the possibility
5 of protecting the Bottom Creek watershed on Poor and Bent
6 Mountains. And consequently, Tier 3 Bottom Creek itself.
7 The construction of the MVP from Milepost 238.25 to Milepost
8 244.5 would actually be an assault on Tier 3 Bottom Creek,
9 its watershed and a major source of Roanoke Valley's
10 drinking water for many reasons.

11 One, the 39 stream crossings in just 6.25 miles
12 per Appendix F-1. Two, an estimated 3 miles or more of
13 paralleled named and unnamed tributaries. Three, an
14 estimated 160 or more acres that will be permanently
15 deforested and maintained. Four, the blasting that will
16 occur on steep, greater than 60 to 70 degree slopes with
17 shallow metamorphic bedrock, and the certainty of erosion on
18 the steep slopes of Poor Mountain, per Appendix K.

19 Five, the resulting sedimentation. Six, the
20 potential discharge of hydrostatic testing influent. Seven,
21 the 18 wetland crossings per Appendix G-1, with others yet
22 to be surveyed. Eight, the construction activities that
23 would result in rerouting, diminished yields and increased
24 turbidity in the multitude of springs in the corridor. And
25 the adverse effects on rare and threatened species

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-99
cont'd

1 inadequately listed in Appendices F-1 and F-5.
2 This section makes a point of saying that the MVP
3 would not cross the impaired section of Bottom Creek, but
4 it's highly likely that its tributaries upstream, like those
5 downstream are also impaired. I'm gonna skip on.

PS3A2-100

6 Explicit measures for protection of Bottom Creek
7 and its tributaries that are stated here include the use of
8 dry open-cut crossings and time-of-year restrictions for
9 instream construction. First of all, dry, open-cut
10 crossings are standard for the whole project and offer no
11 extra protection for the high-quality waters discussed here.

12 Second, the time of year restrictions, according
13 to Appendices F-1 and 5 are only applied to 4 out of the 39
14 crossings in the watershed. This needs to be corrected
15 since all are wild natural trout streams. All of these
16 waters are also habitats for rare and threatened species,
17 including the Orangefin Madtom and three other species
18 including Bigeye Jumprock, River Darter and Roanoke Darter,
19 none of which were listed in the DEIS and its Appendices,
20 with the exception of the listing of the Orangefin Madtom at
21 Milepost 242 down in Mill Creek. They should all four be
22 listed in all the tributaries on Bent Mountain. And the
23 impacts are not short-term.

24 MS. REYNOLDS: My name is Elizabeth Terry
25 Reynolds. And I have a piece of property on Zero Bottom

PS3A2-100

Open-cut dry crossings would be used for all waterbodies. See the response to comment LA15-12 regarding the open-cut dry waterbody crossing method. Timing restrictions were updated as appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-101

1 Creek Road. It's rented to a farmer that he uses for hay
2 and cattle. The center line is gonna come right beside
3 where the water is on my property and it'll divide his
4 cattle being able to get over there to the water, and that
5 also has watersheds on it. It has an old homestead on the
6 bottom of the property.

7 Recently one of the Mountain Valley surveyors
8 tried to buy that piece of property, an easement on it from
9 my neighbor and was gonna -- he said, "That's not my
10 property, it belongs to Elizabeth Terry Reynolds." And he
11 said, "I don't care. I'll give you this money for it." So
12 he was honest enough not to accept any money for that piece
13 of property, and here recently he put his cattle in there,
14 but before he does that, he has to check the fence.

15 And my neighbor said he looked out there one day
16 and there were about 30 surveyors right in the middle of the
17 field. So back to where he was gonna put his cows out, he
18 always goes around the fence, make sure the fence looks
19 good, and there was a fence dropped. So I assume that's how
20 they got in there, the surveyors did. And he ended up
21 having to fix that.

PS3A2-102

22 I also own a piece of property up on Poor
23 Mountain. It's 8744 Honeysuckle Road. Mountain Valley
24 wants to use that as a staging area, and I have that rented
25 out to a wind farm. I rented it out in 2007. The rent runs

PS3A2-101

See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding cattle. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-102

Statements regarding Mountain Valley land surveyors are noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-102
cont'd

1 to 2021. So far, so I'm in a binding lease with them. And
2 when surveyors, when they send me letters and wanna go on my
3 property, I send 'em letters back saying no, you can't come.
4 And I just had an incident two weeks ago where I had to ask
5 them to leave.

PS3A2-103

6 And I also have easement on there with AEP. But
7 that was put in place a long time ago. And I'm gonna speak
8 on the behalf of my mother, who's 92, and I have her Power
9 of Attorney. She has a piece of property at 8873 Poor
10 Mountain Road, and her fields are also used for hay. She
11 has a barn that's rented out to a wood maker, who's had it
12 for, I don't know, 30 years or more.

13 There's a house on that property and it was
14 rented out till the surveying started. The woman that lived
15 there, her family just had to run off so many of the
16 surveyors they just said, "We're taking you out, we're not
17 having you with all these strange men," you know, around
18 that area. We don't know anything about them. So
19 unfortunately, my mother lost that rent on that property.
20 And she's on a fixed income, so my brothers and my sister
21 and I have to pony-up for the rest of that because she has
22 no money to pay for anything.

PS3A2-104

23 And also all that area has been put in the
24 Virginia Rural Historic District. It's called the
25 Coles-Terry District. We have about five homes and it's

PS3A2-103

Comment noted.

PS3A2-104

Section 4.10 of the final EIS provides a discussion of the Coles-Terry Rural Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-104
cont'd

1 been in our family for six generations. My son is the
2 seventh generation. So I do not want the Mountain Valley
3 Pipeline coming through there. We've been keeping that
4 undeveloped for years. And that's a pretty piece of
5 property up there. I would just hate to see it, all that
6 watershed, my little farmer takes his soil samples to
7 Virginia Tech and has them all tested. And thank you.

8 MS. TANNER-SUTTON: My name is Linda
9 Tanner-Sutton. I'm on the obvious innumerable significant
10 adverse environmental impacts the proposed Mountain Valley
11 Pipeline project would undoubtedly cause. I would like to
12 focus on one that would have the greatest impact -- in
13 violation to the Clean Water Act.

14 Virginia Science SOLs teach students the
15 principles of gravity and properties of water, soil and
16 rocks, starting in kindergarten. One does not have to be a
17 scientist to understand that major construction in a
18 watershed, especially in close proximity to, or crossing
19 streams, rivers, reservoirs, wetlands and underground
20 aquifers can cause major, possibly irreparable harm to
21 watersheds and drinking water for everybody in all the
22 counties included in the project area. Not to mention the
23 entire ecosystem.

PS3A2-106

24 As a resident of Roanoke County, Spring Hollow
25 reservoir is the source of my water and the high risk of

PS3A2-105

The projects are not in violation the CWA. The companies would have to obtain CWA Section 401 permits from the states and CWA Section 404 permits from the COE, as discussed in sections 1 and 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3A2-106

Spring Hollow Reservoir, surface water protection areas and public supply intakes are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment PS2B1-20 regarding dust control.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-106
cont'd

1 contamination, whether supposedly temporary or possibly
2 permanent is not acceptable. All mitigation measures
3 described in the DEIS, especially in karst terrain, provide
4 little or no detail how they would be implemented or how
5 effective they would actually be.

6 Providing adequate quantities of potable water
7 during repair or replacement of damaged water supply or a
8 temporary water source to sustain livestock while a new
9 water supply well is constructed is not acceptable. Or
10 compensating landowners for losses in crops.

11 In addition, the use of an estimated 55,000
12 gallons per day of water for dust control in area may also
13 cause an unacceptable adverse impact on the communities'
14 vital water supply.

PS3A2-107

15 In conclusion, it is completely incomprehensible
16 that, after all the outside expert technical input that was
17 submitted, the DEIS came to the conclusion that no long-term
18 or significant impacts on surface waters are anticipated as
19 a result of the project. Or that the construction operation
20 of the pipeline would result in limited adverse
21 environmental impacts with the exception of impacts on
22 forests. Forests are a critical part of the watershed,
23 which provides necessary resources we cannot afford to lose
24 or even put at risk for endangering. Thank you.

25 MS. BITTINGER: My name is Paula Bittinger. I

PS3A2-107

Conclusions in the EIS are based on facts. See the response to comment FA15-5 regarding forest impacts.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-108 1 live at 10325 Tinsley Lane, Bent Mountain, Virginia. I'm a
2 licensed on-site soil evaluator. Let me begin by saying, I
3 really object to the narrow scope of the DEIS. Because I
4 really don't think it takes into consideration MVP and other
5 proposed pipelines as programmatic and their effect on the
6 global climate change. Expanding fossil fuels in this
7 country will not meet our obligations under the Climate
8 Change Report. All right --

PS3A2-108 Climate change and cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13.

PS3A2-109 9 Number one, Bottom Creek. Located on Bent
10 Mountain, is the only Tier 3 highest quality water body
11 downstream from the proposed pipeline. I live in close
12 proximity to Mill Creek, a tributary of Bottom Creek. I put
13 an undefinable value on our clean water, not just for the
14 Bent Mountain residents, but all the residents using our
15 watershed, which includes the entire Roanoke Valley.

PS3A2-109 See the response to comment FA11-17 regarding Bottom Creek.

PS3A2-110 16 Number two. Due to the shallow soil to bedrock,
17 construction of this pipeline will require a lot of
18 extensive blasting. Blasting will result in long-term
19 erosion and potential threats to residents' wells and
20 springs, including, but not limited to, reduced water
21 quality, spills and changes in flow.
22 To qualify, how residents in this area of the
23 Blue Ridge, wells drilled for water come from natural
24 fissures and fractures in the bedrock. Unnatural fractures
25 made from blasting will impact the quality of our water.

PS3A2-110 Impacts on soils are discussed in section 4.2. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-111 1 Three. I live in close proximity to wetlands,
2 which is a potential habitat to the endangered bog turtle.
3 FERC needs to require, not just recommend, that Mountain
4 Valley Pipeline complete comprehensive wetlands surveys in
5 Poor and Bent Mountain. These wetlands are integral to the
6 health of all the tributaries of the Tier 3 Bottom Creek.

PS3A2-112 7 Four. Every tributary in the Bottom Creek
8 watershed is classified as a wild natural trout stream.
9 These wild natural trout streams are required to be
10 protected.

PS3A2-113 11 My final comment. The residents of the
12 communities impacted by the Mountain Valley construction
13 have only one entity to represent us. That is FERC. Please
14 don't dismiss our concerns. It is your duty as the
15 governing body that represents the people of these
16 communities to do us justice by providing a thorough and
17 complete environmental impact statement of all the negative
18 impacts the construction of this pipeline will bring and how
19 can this possibly be for the people? Thank you.

PS3A2-114 20 MR. TERRY: I'm Frank H. Terry, Jr., and I would
21 like to talk about the first time the MVP came on my
22 property, it was early in April and they didn't have
23 permission or had contacted me in any way. And I wanna talk
24 about how they go through the wooded part of my property,
25 how they go through the land, cross creeks, Tier 3 creeks.

PS3A2-111 Wetlands are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The bog turtle is discussed in section 4.7 of the EIS.

PS3A2-112 Bottom Creek's status as a trout stream is listed in appendix F of the EIS.

PS3A2-113 The concerns of citizens, expressed in comments filed in the FERC public record, were taken into consideration by staff during the production of the final EIS.

PS3A2-114 The statement regarding Mountain Valley's surveyors is noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-114
cont'd

1 I wanna talk about the forestry service and I
2 wanna talk about -- I can't remember what I'm thinking about
3 -- I guess that's about it. That's all of the stuff I wanna
4 talk about. Thank you.

PS3A2-115

5 MS. FERRANTE: My name is Pamela Ferrante. I'm
6 an affected landowner and an intervenor for Montgomery
7 County, Milepost 223. Because of the unaddressed concerns,
8 I will identify below and other significant information gaps
9 on many issues that have been noted by other citizens. I
10 request that FERC issue a new DEIS with complete and
11 corrected information so that the public has an opportunity
12 to assess and comment on the potential impacts of the
13 project prior to the issuance of the final Environmental
14 Impact Statement.

PS3A2-116

15 I'm very disappointed FERC does not recognize
16 concerns of citizens involving the construction of a
17 pipeline through remote mountainous area. If FERC does not
18 issue a new DEIS, I request FERC choose the "no-action"
19 alternative. I oppose the construction of this pipeline in
20 its entirety because of the inevitable environmental damage
21 and hardships placed on the citizens along its route.

PS3A2-117

22 I also recognize that FERC may approve this
23 project. I'm equally concerned about the potential
24 environmental impact of the proposed Mount Tabor Variation
25 Route that will still threaten Slussers Chapel Conservation

PS3A2-115 See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The final EIS revises the draft and presents an analysis of newly filed data.

PS3A2-116 The final EIS takes into consideration the comments filed on the draft. The No Action Alternative is discussed in section 3.

PS3A2-117 See the response to comment CO6-1 regarding the Mount Tabor Variation. The VADCR's proposed alternative route to avoid the Slussers Chapel Cave Conservation Site is discussed in section 3 of the final EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-117
cont'd

1 Site, the Mount Tabor Sinkhole Plain, the Old Mill
2 Conservation Site and Mill Creek Springs and National Area
3 Preserve.

4 I support the Virginia Department Conservation
5 and Recreation Avoidance Concept route. This route will
6 avoid the sensitive Mount Tabor karst area. MVP did not

PS3A2-118

7 assess the preparedness of local emergency responders along
8 the proposed pipeline route. FERC had asked MVP for this
9 assessment on two occasions, August 11th, 2015, and again on
10 December 24th, 2015. MVP's reply to FERC on both occasions
11 was inadequate.

12 MVP did not include all emergency responders as
13 was requested, but only fire agencies. Even with this
14 omission, MVP did not assess, as was requested, the
15 equipment or labor force of the responders they did list.
16 For the capabilities of these agencies, the MVP blatantly
17 gave a blanket statement that "they are trained and
18 qualified."

19 The assessment requested by FERC is needed for
20 proper funding and training of all emergency responders
21 along the proposed pipeline route. Why did FERC accept
22 MVP's inadequate response?

PS3A2-119

23 I'm opposed to the proposed amendments to the
24 Forest Plain outlined in the DEIS. These proposed
25 amendments are disturbing and will impact the future of the

PS3A2-118

See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency plans.

PS3A2-119

See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1 regarding Amendments to the LRMP.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-119
cont'd

1 Jefferson National Forest. A 500-foot row is ridiculous.
2 Proposed permit to allow MVP to exceed restrictions on soil
3 and repairing corridor conditions is not acceptable.
4 The environmental regulatory protections that are
5 already in place for federally protected forestland in
6 watershed areas should not be overwritten. In fact, these
7 regulatory protections should be more stringent for such a
8 project instead of the minimal environmental protections
9 that now exist.
10 Allowing MVP to avoid the environmental controls
11 mandated by NEPA strictly for a for-profit company and in
12 total disregard of the environment and effects on citizens
13 is inexcusable.

PS3A2-120

14 In conclusion, we do not need this pipeline.
15 Pipelines already in existence need proper maintenance to
16 improve efficiency of transport and prevent ongoing
17 environmental pollution. The proposed MVP pipeline and the
18 gas transported in it will provide no additional benefits to
19 the citizens in this area, but will have a detrimental
20 impact in the environment, which will affect all citizens
21 for generations to come.
22 The purpose of the MVP is for the sole interest
23 of a few private corporations to make a 12% profit at the
24 expense of the citizens. I oppose this pipeline.
25 MR. REDSTAR: Bear Redstar. I'm here from South

PS3A2-120

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

172

1 Dakota. My people are fighting from that tar sand and
2 Dakota Access Pipeline. And if this pipeline that comes
3 through here, if any disaster would hit, it would be just as
4 what happened in Alaska, but worse. I worked on the Alaska
5 Pipeline before and promising jobs. I took where the money
6 was at. And disaster hit there, and we had to go back and
7 do the cleanup, was devastating.

PS3A2-121

8 And I can just imagine what is going to be going
9 through the mountains here. Because Dakotas, we don't have
10 trees and the wildlife like what y'all have here, and the
11 fresh water, 'cuz our water's polluted from the sands of
12 digging for uranium.

13 And when that pipeline was developed, it
14 destroyed our water and our equal system in South Dakota.
15 And we can just imagine what these pipelines coming in from
16 the Dakotas and here will be devastating to the mountains
17 and the wildlife and of natural resources, the water,
18 because the water here and the Smith Mountain Lake -- when I
19 came, when I swam in it, I was telling my fianc e that this
20 water was nice and blue, clear, was fresh[er] water than we
21 have back home. Because our main water system was being
22 polluted, is not blue. It's kind 'a like a grayish-brown.
23 When you turn the water on, that's what, dirty water coming
24 out.

25 My people have been getting sick, the Lakota and

PS3A2-121

The are many existing pipelines that go over mountains; including the Rockies, Sierra, and Cascades. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. It is unlikely that the health issues of the Lakota Nation are related to natural gas transportation pipelines. Our EIS concluded that the projects would probably not have significant adverse impacts on most environmental resources (except for the clearing of forest).

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

173

1 Dakota and Nakota people. And the seven tribes of the
2 Dakotas, the health problems that the children are having
3 nowadays, due to these pipelines. And what these three
4 pipelines coming through, especially in Missouri and
5 Mississippi, if the pipeline was to break open, just like it
6 happened in two places, Alaska and Louisiana.

7 When I was in Florida, the Gulf Coast was, the
8 ocean there wasn't really a crystal-clear ocean, because the
9 people were not allowed to swim, so if these pipelines come
10 through, it'll be devastating. Corporations need to look at
11 what disaster would happen and what the cost of clean-up and
12 everything would do with our future generations. That's all
13 I have to say.

14 MS. ROKICKI: Monica Rokicki. My company is
15 Better Building Works, and the reason I started it was
16 because I really wanted to understand the impact of
17 buildings and infrastructure on the environment. And in
18 that role, I have a very pragmatic approach. It's a return
19 on investment approach. And I am always concerned with not
20 only the property owners' interests, but also the public's
21 best interest, which is, of course, part of FERC's most
22 important responsibilities.

23 I'm pragmatic in that I always look at what the
24 possible environmental impacts of a site or development of a
25 site might be, so for example, a fuel tank. If we were

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

174

1 going to remediate a fuel tank, it's a very expensive
2 process and involves Environmental Phase 1, 2, 3, and
3 typically will cost quite a bit of money.

PS3A2-122

4 I'm concerned about the pipeline's future cost to
5 future generations. And that public is the most important
6 public that we need to solve for.

7 There is the idea of negotiation in this process.
8 Is this a negotiation with the past? History? Fossil
9 fuels? Best-laid plans? Well, all of these best-laid plans
10 have intentions involved with them. And those intentions
11 may no longer be relevant. They may be 20th Century
12 impressions and intentions that no longer hold in light of
13 current knowledge.

14 In fact, if we think about future negotiations,
15 we are borrowing the land from our children. And the cost
16 of the remediation, even if nothing goes wrong, will be
17 significant. In fact, maybe many, many times the original
18 cost of the pipeline, many times even the profit that can be
19 garnered from the pipeline. And how can we know that the
20 pipeline will not simply go bankrupt and unable to cover
21 these costs?

22 In fact, that constitutes a perpetual easement on
23 the landscape of our children's wellbeing and prosperity by
24 making them bear the brunt of the risk. It creates an open,
25 unlimited opportunity to use this land for anything, this

PS3A2-122

Socioeconomic issues are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding bankruptcy and financial responsibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 175

1 thousand-mile pipeline with a undefined easement, depending
2 on what is negotiated with landowners.

PS3A2-123 3 And thus, this constitutes a private benefit for
4 particular private entities. Who benefits? How much? How
5 long? Why is this not a matter of public record? Who pays?
6 How much? How long? Why is this not a matter of public
7 record? And not only for present landowners, but for the
8 future.

9 The Paris Agreement will go into effect tomorrow,
PS3A2-124 10 November 4th, 2016. The Paris Agreement has a big picture.
11 The big picture is climate change. Fossil fuels are not
12 part of the future. Fossil fuels are part of the past.
13 The public's best interest is to wholly reject,
14 not only this pipeline, but hopefully any pipeline. It is
15 to transition to fossil fuels now, to use and improve
16 existing rail because it has lower risk, and quantifiable
17 damages. Renewables are available now at good return on
18 investment, especially for those future costs.

19 We must eliminate private gains and make
20 everything known, all of these costs and benefits known to
21 the public, not only present costs and benefits, but future
22 costs and benefits and risks. Thank you very much.

PS3A2-125 23 MR. JONES: George A. Jones. I have property in
24 Giles Creek County that MVP is gonna go through. And I'm
25 not happy about it. I just don't think it's right that

PS3A2-123 See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefit. Compensation is between the landowner and the Applicants.

PS3A2-124 Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13. See the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy and fossil fuels.

PS3A2-125 Landowner rights are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

176

PS3A2-125
cont'd

1 companies like this can override individuals' rights, take
2 their property and do what they want to with it with no
3 regard to my feelings about it.

4 I just wish that there was a solution to this.
5 It looks like the government is not any help, so I'm not
6 sure where my strength's coming from, except from the Lord
7 and that's what I have to rely on. Just maybe somewhere
8 along the way, somebody will find a good reason to get this
9 project stopped. That sure would be a blessing to me if
10 that were to happen.

PS3A2-126

11 MS. HADDEN: My name is Nancy Hadden. And I am
12 here because the pipeline is gonna run about 175 yards from
13 my backdoor and it does not run on my property. It runs on
14 my neighbor's property. And I am concerned because I have a
15 70-foot deep well that the karst topography that I live on,
16 that the blasting that will be necessary to cut through the
17 rock to build this pipeline will affect my water system.

18 And I feel that the FERC has not adequately
19 addressed outlying properties that will also be affected and
20 how we might -- I don't feel that the MVP has adequately
21 addressed how they might mitigate water for those of us who
22 don't live on affected properties. I feel like all of the
23 land within our area could very easily be affected by any
24 blasting.

25 And I did read the majority of the DEIS. In

PS3A2-126

Impacts on water wells are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The EIS addresses karst terrain in section 4.1. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-127 1 groups, we read large sections of it, and came back and
2 shared and it was not addressed how adjacent landowners
3 would be reimbursed and/or compensated for damage done to
4 their property. Or how it will affect property values in
5 the area.

PS3A2-128 6 Personally, there have been the three properties
7 closest to me have all been on the market in the last year
8 over concerns from the pipeline. One of them was on the
9 market for a year, a highly desired property in Newport,
10 Virginia, a beautiful farm with acreage and heated barns has
11 had, in the past, competition for the purchase of that land,
12 and because the pipeline has gone through it, it was on the
13 market for one year, and then removed from the market. No
14 one would come and look at it.

15 Our neighbors across the road, who live probably
16 200 yards from the pipeline in Newport, have had their house
17 on the market for over six months, and all of these have
18 depreciated property and sale values, and still no one's
19 coming to look at them. And a property down the road from
20 us sold for \$150,000 less than it would have, after being on
21 the market for a year, because the people had to move, were
22 forced to move because of a job and relocate, and property
23 values are already being affected. And the pipeline is not
24 even running on those properties.

25 And they've said that that simply is not the

PS3A2-127 See the responses to comment IND12-1 regarding property values. See the responses to comment IND277-6 regarding damages and responsibility.

PS3A2-128 See the responses to comment IND12-1 regarding property values.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-129

1 case, which any sane person would realize that it is
2 actually in fact the case. It does affect all of our
3 property values. I'm in the blast zone of the pipeline, and
4 my son's bedroom is also in the blast zone of the pipeline.
5 That is a huge concern. And I also am concerned because
6 it's running -- they moved the pipeline away from a
7 preschool, but they only moved it 75 yards to relocate the
8 line to compensate for the fact that the preschool is there.
9 And I don't think that that is far enough and certainly
10 should be looked at.

PS3A2-130

11 And that's in Newport, Virginia, on Route 42 at
12 our Newport Rec Center where we all regularly gather. And
13 it's now being moved to run right next door to the church
14 that I attend every Sunday, which I would consider a high
15 consequence area because of the number of people who attend
16 that church on a regular basis. And so they just slipped it

PS3A2-131

17 over. And that's right through the heart of our historic
18 district.
19 And none of those things have been adequately
20 addressed in the DEIS study, and I feel like, you know, if
21 people were really caring about attention to detail they
22 would have certainly gone above and beyond to make note of
23 that, and some of these buildings and structures don't even
24 appear on any of the maps that the MVP has submitted.
25 That's all I have to say.

PS3A2-129

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

PS3A2-130

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND133-1 regarding the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church.

PS3A2-131

The Newport Recreation Center is 945 feet away from the pipeline; the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church 430 feet away. These buildings would not be adversely affected. See the response to comment IND133-1 regarding the Greater Newport Rural Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

179

PS3A2-132

1 MS. LAW: My name is Bonnie Law. In the
2 Wirtz/Bonbrook Mill Road area in Franklin County, Virginia,
3 there are four churches, two large cemeteries, a school, two
4 major subdivisions, high density housing and ten businesses
5 who are in the "kill" zone of this one two-mile basic area.
6 This is completely unacceptable for the Mountain Valley
7 Pipeline proposed route.

8 When the survey and stakes were driven in the
9 ground right at Sandy Ridge Baptist Church's cemetery on
10 Bonbrook Mill Road in Franklin County, Virginia, I'm sorry.
11 I lost all respect for MVP and for FERC. I thought this is
12 obviously a mistake, because who in their right mind would
13 allow this to be constructed beside a large cemetery?

14 Unfortunately, I was wrong. The new route that
15 was issued on October 14th, 2016, by MVP to FERC proved this
16 to be true to my complete and utter disbelief. I do not
17 want to live beside a 42" natural gas pipeline, oh, excuse
18 me, a "ticking bomb" for the rest of my life, and I will
19 not.

20 Mountain Valley Pipeline will not cross my land,
21 but proposes to cross the property adjoining me, which puts
22 me in the quarter-mile kill zone. This project should never
23 be allowed through such a high-density area. If it is
24 allowed, then FERC or MVP should enter negotiations with
25 landowners to purchase their entire properties.

PS3A2-132

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

PS3A2-133 1 I want this comment directed to the United States
2 Forestry Service. We have 100% pure American Chestnut trees
3 that are 20 to 30 years old, growing in the Franklin County,
4 Virginia, area, in the path of the proposed pipeline. We
5 may very well be on the verge of destroying a genetically
6 viable national treasure, and I would like to hear from Ms.
7 Bettina Ring regarding this matter.

PS3A2-134 8 In closing, I vehemently disagree with how FERC
9 is structured financially to run its own agency. I
10 seriously question your funding structure, whether it leads
11 to insight or corruption and political favoritism. This
12 must be changed for transparency of operations.

PS3A2-135 13 MR. BOB CRAWFORD: I'm Bob Crawford of Roanoke.
14 My concerns are many, but I've picked out a couple of
15 points. One is that the draft Environmental Impact
16 Statement is incomplete, as is shown by the fact the MVP has
17 released new and revised information after the draft EIS
18 itself was released. Well, that makes it pretty clearly
19 incomplete.

20 I also have a concern for how adequate the Forest
21 Service information evaluation of the project can be when
22 the information from MVP is incomplete. I'll just let that
23 be my comments.

24 MR. DAN CRAWFORD: I'm Dan Crawford. I live in
25 Roanoke City. I'm commenting to FERC. After having read a

PS3A2-133 Impacts on trees are discussed in section 4.4 of the EIS.

PS3A2-134 FERC is funded by Congress.

PS3A2-135 See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-136

1 good bit of the DEIS, being very impressed with the apparent
2 grasp of problems that are very, very complicated, and then
3 being very disappointed with how the problems were issued,
4 how the issue of mitigation.

5 Now mitigation generally was indicated that
6 procedures would follow certain regulations as they exist.
7 Regulations only exist in a relevant form, when they refer
8 to something we're already familiar with. In other words,
9 if this then this. And the complication with the MVP
10 proposal is that you might have this, but we have never
11 dealt with the construction of, or even proposal for a
12 project of this size, about the scale of it.

13 And this is the first time we've dealt with
14 something of this scale. And it makes it very difficult to
15 regulate it, because we've never done this before. It's a
16 new ballgame. I think that the Environmental Impact
17 Statement needs to be redone personally. I think in the
18 statement, there are a lot of details that are addressed and
19 with sophisticated language and obvious effort.

PS3A2-137

20 One of the issues that I am personally most
21 invested in, is the bigger issue of climate change. And we
22 all know now, we should be minimizing the use and dependence
23 on fossil fuels and building those turbines and solar
24 panels. That really needs to be what we're doing and where
25 we're spending the billions of dollars.

PS3A2-136

See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS3A2-137

Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy and fossil fuels.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-137
cont'd

1 I feel like investing in further dependence or
2 use on any fossil fuel, including natural gas, is a giant
3 step in the wrong direction. We would invest billions in
4 something that really would be far better to our benefit if
5 we'd spend it on wind turbines and solar panels.

6 The consequences of the project, and again,
7 knowing that we have never done anything like this before,
8 are unsettling at best. I appreciate the effort FERC is
9 making, given the nature of the challenge here,
10 unprecedented project.

PS3A2-138

11 The recent exchanges over the proposed 500-foot
12 corridor that the National Forest Service seems to be
13 supportive of on some level, is very unsettling, but it
14 suggests a future where we will continue to be moving vast
15 resources over distances in the mountains to suit our power
16 needs, when the reality is, we know how to create power
17 locally and use it locally.

18 We have those systems now. It's not happening in
19 Virginia. Virginia's one of only ten states in the union
20 with no industrial wind or solar. But the rest of the world
21 and a lot of the nation's already getting it. We're
22 building the solar panels, the wind turbines. We don't need
23 to be moving vast energy resources over vast distances.

24 So the idea of a 500-foot energy corridor seems,
25 again, a big step in the wrong direction. I think our

PS3A2-138

See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 future, if we're gonna have one, is gonna be wind and solar.

2 I appreciate the time. I appreciate your effort.

3 MS. JONES: Yvette Jones. My first issue with
4 this is -- we've been going on the surveys with all of the
5 survey crews. It's been very difficult to get them to plan
6 this to our schedule. And once we finally get that worked
7 out with them, they seem to have just a certain criteria
8 that they're going to meet. They're not worried about any
9 individual concerns about whatever property that they're
10 looking at.

PS3A2-139

11 They already know what they're gonna look at, to
12 the comments of, "We don't really need to go to your
13 property. We can just look at our computer and do it." But
14 we have to actually walk there and map GPS coordinates. And
15 they're gonna know if we go or not. And they go and they
16 check and box and that's it. They were never worried about
17 looking at certain things, but once they got up there, the
18 things that they thought they would not find, they did find.

PS3A2-139

The statement regarding Mountain Valley's surveyors is noted.

PS3A2-140

19 Now did they make note of that? Is it important
20 in the end? Probably not. One of the biggest issues is the
21 water. They never wanted to go look at our water up there.
22 Until finally this past week, they figured out that we have
23 a spring that we've been telling 'em about for a year. And
24 they want to go look at the water. Without a letter,
25 without us present, just all of a sudden, [they] wanna call

PS3A2-140

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

184

1 and go look at it. And that's not fair to us to do that.

2 We've been trying to get them to do that for over a year.

PS3A2-141

3 The water is the issue. The water is what we are

4 concerned about. What kind of water is gonna be left there

5 for our grandchildren? Do you have an answer for that? Do

6 you have an answer for what kind of water MVP is gonna leave

7 there? And why not? You're just here to take more

8 comments, so you can't answer any questions? Adlei Jones

9 Farm. And you're actually going to provide us with an

10 answer? You'll try. Okay. You think our water might come

11 out looking something like that?

12 Would you want your grandchildren to drink that?

13 Would you? Would you drink it? But you expect our

14 grandchildren to drink that? In ten years or twenty years

15 or a hundred years. MVP does. And FERC does. Are you

16 going to give me an answer to that? No, not even try. My

17 grandchildren. My great-grandchildren. Since we've been

18 there since 1775. Are we gonna have another hundred years

19 there? Of drinkable water? We do now. We have since 1775.

20 MR. TRIBLE: My name's Dave Tribble. I live at

21 10430 Ivy Ridge Road, Bent Mountain, Virginia 24059. I'm

22 here because I'm quite concerned about the pipeline and its

23 routing. I'm a professional wetland scientist by trade.

24 I've been doing that for about 15 years now. Master's

25 degree from Tech.

PS3A2-141

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

185

PS3A2-142

1 I've been studying the route quite a bit, given
2 that it's in my backyard basically. One of the things I
3 would like FERC to consider during this review process is
4 the actual routing of the project. Bent Mountain is located
5 at the northernmost terminus of the Blue Ridge Plateau and,
6 as such, is flat as a board. There's no better place for
7 water to pool up in wetlands and streams and different
8 things like that.

9 I think FERC really needs to take a hard look at
10 Bent Mountain and the natural resources that we have there,
11 pristine, top of the watershed stuff, and consider that.
12 Because if you move, while I'm vehemently opposed to the
13 project overall, if you move in one direction or another,
14 you avoid an extensive wetland and stream complex.

15 It's almost a slap in the face to go through
16 there from a hydrological standpoint. We have streams and
17 wetlands everywhere. And it speaks to the inability or lack
18 of concern on the part of the MVP designers in my opinion.
19 Because anybody in their right mind, particularly when
20 you're talking about wetland and stream mitigation and the
21 costs associated with it, should be looking elsewhere. They
22 should go north or south of Bent Mountain.

23 So I think looking at the route, in fact, I was
24 looking at the maps here, talking with FERC employees, and
25 you can see on every single map, they're going right through

PS3A2-142

We discuss pipeline routing in section 3 of the EIS. Impacts and proposed mitigation for water resources and wetlands is discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 the stream and wetland corridors when they could easily
2 round-about and it would be an easier curvature on routing
3 the pipeline and it would get up in fields and on slopes
4 where you don't have critical water resources.

PS3A2-143

5 We are the top of the watershed. We are who
6 provides water for the rest of Salem, Roanoke, Franklin
7 County, etcetera. You screw up the top of the watershed,
8 you've screwed up everything from there on down. So I think

PS3A2-144

9 FERC should deny this project because I don't believe in
10 imminent domain for capital gain.

11 But more importantly and more specifically, I
12 think more FERC needs to look at how this route totally
13 disregards the natural resources that we have and that we're
14 gonna rely on for decades, centuries to come. There are
15 alternatives and there are -- you know, just because MVP
16 doesn't wanna spend money to reroute this thing, so what?
17 Deal with it. You're looking at making billions anyway.

PS3A2-145

18 Go around this wetland. Go around that mountain,
19 one of the most prime natural resource areas in this region.
20 Do your homework on Bent Mountain. It's a hydrologically,
21 topographically, biologically, it's got everything. So you
22 shouldn't trample over that just because MVP doesn't wanna
23 reroute. Thank you for your time.

24 MR. SHAFFER: My name is Clifford A. Shaffer.
25 I'm an affected landowner, 249 Brookside Lane. It's near

PS3A2-143

Impacts and proposed mitigation for water resources and wetlands is discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-144

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

PS3A2-145

We discuss pipeline routing in section 3 of the EIS. Impacts and proposed mitigation for water resources and wetlands is discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 Milepost 213, I believe. I'm here today to express my
2 objections to multiple aspects of FERC's decision-making
3 process regarding the Mountain Valley Pipeline project.

PS3A2-146

4 My most fundamental objection is, this process
5 does not meet the minimum standards necessary for rational
6 decision-making, either in terms of common sense or the law.
7 To make any rational decision on a matter requires weigh of
8 costs versus benefits. However the DEIS does not seriously
9 address the issue of benefits, as defined by need for the
10 project.

PS3A2-146

See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The Commission has not yet made a decision about the projects. However, their decision making process is based on the consolidated record.

PS3A2-147

11 There are sections in the DEIS that use the word
12 "need", but these address only issues such as the fact that
13 the pipeline will deliver such-and-such amount of gas to
14 such-and-such a terminus. Or that there are subscribers to
15 purchase the delivered gas. While this might be a
16 justification for why the pipeline could be a profitable
17 business venture for the company, it's not a need, and
18 therefore not sufficient justification to support imminent
19 domain proceedings.

PS3A2-147

See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS3A2-148

20 A need might be something like identifying a
21 population that needs energy. Defined that way, it then
22 becomes possible to rationally compare against alternatives
23 for how energy can be supplied to that population.

24 My next objections relate to the scope of the
25 assessment being made. FERC's assessment of both climate

PS3A2-148

Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-148
cont'd

1 altering greenhouse gas emissions and the effect of those
2 emissions on the environment is inadequate. FERC's analysis
3 is opaque and difficult to evaluate and appears to ignore
4 significant emission sources, such as pipeline leakage and
5 production of the fracked gas that will be carried on the
6 MVP.

7 Further, FERC does not use readily available
8 tools such as the social cost of carbon to estimate the
9 environmental impacts of the greenhouse gas emissions, but
10 simply compares the project annual greenhouse gas emissions
11 to the MVP project to global greenhouse gas emissions and
12 concludes they are insignificant.

13 FERC's approach mirrors its flaws analysis in
14 other pipeline proceedings, which EPA has repeatedly
15 criticized for failing to comply with the Council on
16 Environment Quality's NEPA Greenhouse Gas Guidance.

PS3A2-149

17 On a broader scale, FERC's runaway permitting of
18 major long-term natural gas pipelines commits the U.S. to
19 continued fossil fuel dependence that's inconsistent with
20 the emission reductions goals necessary to curb global
21 warming, and commitments made on international agreements
22 such as those of the Paris Climate Conference.

PS3A2-150

23 My next concern has to do with the effect of
24 bifurcating the impact and risk to this region posed by a
25 series of proposed pipeline projects. Conceivably the

PS3A2-149

The Commission complies with the NGA. National energy policy is made by the President and Congress.

PS3A2-150

Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

189

PS3A2-150
cont'd

1 impacts are outweighed by the benefits for any one of those
2 projects, but it's another thing entirely to recognize the
3 impact of multiple projects, each of whose impacts and
4 benefits are affected by the existence of the other
5 projects.

6 While the benefits of the collection are less
7 than the sum of the individual benefits, it appears that the
8 damage of each is at least as great as the sum of its parts.
9 In short, the multiple pipelines are not being considered in
10 their aggregate effect. I understand this to be a violation
11 of NEPA.

PS3A2-151

12 Other objections relate to the flawed data
13 collection process that forms the DEIS. The MVP data are
14 flawed and rushed, so how can a DEIS based on this
15 information be adequate? NEPA requires agencies to take a
16 hard look at the environmental impacts of a proposed project
17 and to make that information available to the public. Here,
18 FERC releases the DEIS despite the absence of information
19 necessary to assess the impacts of the project on a wide
20 range of resources, including streams, wetlands, threatened
21 and endangered species, cultural resources and recreation
22 resources, such as the Appalachian Trail.

23 FERC has said that MVP can submit the missing
24 information before construction begins. This, however,
25 prevents the meaningful public participation in the

PS3A2-151

See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS; endangered species in section 4.7; cultural resources in section 4.10; recreation and the ANST in section 4.8. Public participation is documented in section 1.4.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-151
cont'd

1 decision-making process as required by NEPA. A thorough
2 analysis subject to public scrutiny is particularly
3 necessary here because a pipeline of this size has never
4 been built through this type of steep terrain and karst
5 geology the MVP would cross.

6 Past experience with adverse effects from
7 construction of much smaller pipelines in the region, such
8 as the Celanese and Stonewall gathering line shows that the
9 public cannot rely on FERC's assurance that such impacts
10 will be successfully mitigated. Karst is not adequately

PS3A2-152

11 addressed. The DEIS does not adequately deal with issues
12 raised in the Kastning Report. The DEIS and MVP's proposal
13 does not adequately address testing of groundwater effect.
14 These needs to be rigorous site-specific evaluation of karst
15 areas within the MVP project footprint before decisions
16 regarding construction are made.

17 This type of evaluation, including methods such
18 as dye-tracer studies, subsurface mapping, geophysical
19 studies and other on-site investigations is critical in
20 ensuring the safe construction operation of pipeline, as
21 well as the protection of water resources and ecological
22 habitats of the area. A failure to adequately address
23 special and delicate nature of karst terrain could result in
24 permanent damage to the people and the environment of the
25 affected areas.

PS3A2-152

Karst terrain is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See also the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

191

PS3A2-153

1 MS. REILLY: Carolyn Reilly. So I am a landowner
2 in Franklin County, Virginia, and my husband and I both,
3 here with me. And I'm really frustrated with the process
4 because it's not really public. Granted, we get to be
5 around each other, the citizens, but we're not really able
6 to hear the concerns, like nobody's gonna get to hear me
7 share right now about my lovely drinking water from my well
8 and share about some of the items from my land that are
9 important to me, such as this pinecone. You can hear this
10 on the microphone. I don't know how you can take notes on
11 it.

12 But this is from trees on my land that the
13 Mountain Valley Pipeline proposed to bulldoze and destroy,
14 trees that my kids like to play on, play under and climb and
15 be a part of. And I'm just one person, I know. But it
16 seems like we don't matter. And you guys are just here to
17 listen. Do we matter. Does this pinecone even matter? I
18 don't know. This is from our garden. The soil that we have
19 that is rich and fertile and is it gonna be torn up and
20 compacted to lay a 42" pipeline?

PS3A2-154

21 Rock. Where I live, it's called Rocky Mount.
22 Virginia. Guess what? There's a lot of rock. Does that
23 mean there's gonna be blasting through our land. What will
24 my kids experience? These are black walnuts from trees on
25 our property. And this is an egg. We have chickens. We

PS3A2-153

See the response to comment IND320-1 regarding public comment sessions. These sessions were open to the public, and all comments were placed into the FERC public records. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Trees are discussed in section 4.4 of the EIS.

PS3A2-154

Shallow bedrock is discussed in section 4.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

192

1 have chickens that are rotated through pasture. We use our
2 land to raise animals for our farm business. This is our
3 livelihood.

PS3A2-155

4 We are farmers. We live on the land. We sell
5 eggs. We don't use chemicals; we don't use sprays. We like
6 for our animals to roam freely on pastures, as well as our
7 chickens, our pigs, our cows. We have turkeys. And this is
8 just to be destroyed.

9 I get this in the mail. And I'm supposed to read
10 through this in six weeks to come and talk about what you
11 all, what MVP says goes to FERC. It doesn't -- you guys
12 just seem like everything can be mitigated. Every little
13 problem, every little egg, every little -- well, look. I
14 made a mess. You guys can charge me for that.

15 So we basically have to leave our farm and our
16 land, where we live and raise our family and our chickens
17 that provide food to the community, because of a pipeline
18 for transmission that is intended for export through
19 contracts with WGL who is an investor of the Mountain Valley
20 Pipeline. There's contracts in place for India. I know.
21 We know.

22 For my family to be uprooted and moved and what?
23 That's it. I know my time's up. I understand. I see the
24 time. Thank you for letting me vent my frustration. And I
25 will go get something to clean that up. I apologize.

PS3A2-155

Measures that Mountain Valley would implement to reduce impacts on farmlands are discussed in sections 2, 4.2, and 4.8 in the EIS. See the response to comment IND362-3 regarding use of property. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding the fact that MVP was not designed for export.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-156
1 MS. GEYER: I'm Janis Geyer. I'm opposing the
2 FERC pipeline. And I'll get into some of the major points,
3 but I am, but I didn't know about before was this 500-foot,
4 the ability to put a lot of utilities down this line and
5 that is very scary because that is a huge environmental
6 impact. It would totally change the environment in a
7 beautiful area that survives on the beauty of the landscape.
8 It's just totally unacceptable.

PS3A2-157
9 I understand the issue about putting pipelines --
10 putting all the utilities in one place -- but you don't put
11 it in the most fragile land possible, and we have an 80-page
12 study done by some of the best karst people and reviewed by
13 the best karst people in the country, saying that this is a
14 very dangerous pipeline.

PS3A2-158
15 The state said that the part near me actually was
16 so dangerous, but it pretty much said "can't do it," because
17 we have karst, we have extremely steep slopes, we have a
18 very active earthquake zone, could be -- we could have a 4
19 Earthquake, but what we have is constant seismic activity.

20 That's not something that you feel, but it's
21 constant. We painted the house, we replaced the door, we
22 looked and our doorframe was really tilted. It's no joke.
23 And the sinkholes are no joke. The slopes are extremely
24 steep. I gather BLM likes a 8 to 16% grade. You're gonna
25 be putting it through some 40% grades. And I don't know

PS3A2-156 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in Jefferson National Forest.

PS3A2-157 Karst terrain is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A2-158 Steep slopes and earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion. Abandonment is discussed in section 2.7 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

194

PS3A2-158
cont'd

1 that any of that's very little, that's 8 to 16%. It's
2 extremely steep slopes, which means you have to have a very
3 intense curve at the top which is dangerous. It's too
4 tight.

5 I have great concerns about the long-term impact
6 after they're not running the gas through it anymore. What
7 happens? The erosion issues because of the steep slopes?
8 Everything around that they've tried to do has terrible
9 erosion problems. It's just too steep. So I talked about
10 the earthquakes and the steep slopes.

PS3A2-159

11 The karst, we have sinkholes everywhere and I
12 mean in particularly where everything was going in
13 everywhere. And we have sinking rivers, where the water
14 goes aboveground and goes underground. It goes aboveground,
15 goes underground. We do not have properly filtered water.
16 Because it doesn't go through soil. It's mostly rock, it's
17 not going through soil.

18 And it can go aboveground and get polluted and go
19 underground, you don't know where it's gone. It moves
20 extremely fast. One of the Tech water testers did a test.
21 The dye made it to the site before he could get in his car.

22 The water issues are no joke. It moves--who
23 knows where--extremely fast. And I know pipelines are
24 supposed to leak, but they all do, some. And we don't know
25 what's in the fracking chemicals. And we just have so many

PS3A2-159

Water quality and streams are discussed in section 4.3.2 of the EIS. See also 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		195
PS3A2-159 cont'd	1 factors, and when you add it all up, it is one of the worst 2 places in the country that they could've put a pipeline. 3 And it has no business here. It's too dangerous.	
PS3A2-160	4 I live very close. I'm almost in the blast zone. 5 And between the blast zone and the fire that comes after 6 while it's emptying out all that -- you know, I figure if it 7 goes, we're gone. We can't get outta the neighborhood. 8 There's no exit. So I just think it's a terribly 9 destructive thing. I think it has very bad long-term 10 implications. 11 For a few years of getting it, we will suffer 12 forever with a pipeline that has got poisons in it that are 13 unknown that will break open, how many years down the road. 14 Nothing good about it. Thanks.	
PS3A2-161	15 MS. SINK: My name is Linda Parsons Sink, and 16 this is about the Old Mill Conservation site. This is an 17 environmentally sensitive area where the pipeline will 18 potentially cross four miles of its watershed. It will be 19 devastating to trench across the Old Mill Conservation site. 20 This will destroy a fragile habitat and underground karst 21 features that filter and supply our water through the Salmon 22 Springs for three houses and four farm areas. 23 MVP and FERC need to find a different alternative 24 that avoids this sensitive conservation site. I also want 25 protection for my family's water supply, and accountability	

PS3A2-160 See the response to comment PS1B1-10 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A2-161 See the response to CO6-1 regarding the Mount Tabor Variation. Section 3 discusses alternative routes that may lessen impacts on the Old Mill Cave Conservation Site.

PS3A2-162 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-162
cont'd

1 that any pipeline construction will not impact our water
2 supply. It should be a priority for MVP and FERC to ensure
3 that my family will continue to have safe and high-quality
4 water originating from Salmon Spring in the Old Mill
5 Conservation site.

PS3A2-163

6 This letter requests a follow-up to the August
7 16th letter sent to FERC, 2016-08165222, outlining concerns
8 about the pipeline traversing the Old Mill Conservation site
9 and Mount Tabor variation route. Since the filing of that
10 letter, neither I, nor my family, have received any updates
11 or additional information from Mountain Valley Pipeline
12 regarding the route.

PS3A2-164

13 I'm a registered intervenor and homeowner that
14 will be impacted by the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposed
15 route through the Old Mill Conservation site, and by the
16 alternative Mount Tabor variation route. As stated in the
17 August 16th letter, the Old Mill Conservation site is a
18 watershed for the Old Mill Cave, designated a significant
19 cave under the Virginia Cave Protection Act of 1979.

20 This cave is located on Frances Parsons'
21 property, Tax Map Number 303-A36, 37, 28. This is my
22 mother's property and adjacent to my property. The cave
23 opening is adjacent to a private, unpaved one-lane road that
24 traverses Mrs. Parsons' property, and the cave stream feeds
25 into Mill Creek, a major contributory stream for the north

PS3A2-163 See the response to CO6-1 regarding the Mount Tabor Variation.

PS3A2-164 Mountain Valley adopted the Mount Tabor Variation into its proposed route. The pipeline would be about a mile away from the Old Mill Cave.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-164
cont'd

1 fork of the Roanoke River.
2 Next to the cave's entrance and adjacent to Mill
3 Creek, there is a major spring called Salmon Spring, which
4 is identified by its name on Mrs. Parson's property deed.
5 Salmon Spring is fed from water through the Old Mill Cave
6 and its watershed. This spring supplies the water for
7 several homes in the area.

8 Whether the pipeline is placed on MVP's proposed
9 route or the alternative Mount Tabor variation route, we are
10 requesting the following protective measures be in place to
11 protect both our water supply and the structure integrity
12 and wildlife of Old Mill Cave.

13 These measures will ensure that Mountain Valley
14 Pipeline is following the mitigation practices as to defined
15 by FERC. These practices are referenced in FERC's DEIS at
16 4.1.2.5. Number one, the name and contact information for
17 the environmental inspector assigned to the project. We
18 would like to schedule a meeting to review safeguards during
19 the construction and confirm the water testing schedule and
20 protocol of that line below.

PS3A2-165

21 Two, we have had our baseline water quality test
22 performed by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service.
23 This is our water supply and our water source originates in
24 the Old Mill Conservation site that will potentially be
25 adversely affected by the construction of the MVP pipeline.

PS3A2-165

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. The landowner is encouraged to negotiate changes to Mountain Valley's proposed water quality testing with Mountain Valley.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-165
cont'd

1 We request that the water testing for our spring start no
2 later than six months before the pipeline construction is
3 within a mile of the Old Mill Conservation site. MVP will
4 be responsible for all expenses related to water testing and
5 ensuring a safe water supply for homes and livestock relying
6 on Salmon Spring.

7 Three, beginning six months prior to the pipeline
8 construction reaching within a one-mile radius of the Old
9 Mill Conservation site, MVP will fund monthly water quality
10 tests for Salmon Spring. The test will be conducted by
11 mutually agreed upon certified lab. Water samples from
12 Salmon Spring will be collected and provided to the lab by
13 Linda or Terry Sink.

14 Four, the water testing parameters are outlined
15 in FERC's DEIS, or at Pages 4-80 and 4-81. In addition, we
16 also request the following parameters be tested for each
17 water sample: arsenic, copper, lead and volatile organic
18 tests for multiple volatile organic chemicals.

19 Five, the lab's results will be provided to MVP
20 Environmental Inspector and to the homeowners, property
21 owners supplied with drinking water from Salmon Spring,
22 Linda and Terry Sink, and Frances Parsons.

23 Six, during the entire time the pipeline
24 construction occurs within the one-mile radius of Old Mill
25 Conservation site's watershed area, MVP will fund all water

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-165
cont'd

1 testing every three days following the protocol described
2 above.
3 Seven, also during the entire time the pipeline
4 construction -- oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I will put it like
5 that. I have not finished the whole letter, but can I just
6 say the last part of the letter?

7 My family is passionately concerned about
8 maintaining our safe water supply from Salmon Spring. We do
9 not want to see the Old Mill Conservation site negatively
10 impacted by construction of a pipeline across its watershed.
11 We want to be proactive in protecting our drinking water
12 source. Old Mill Conservation's protection should also be a
13 top priority for MVP and FERC. Thank you.

14 MS. CRENSHAW: My name is Susan Crenshaw, and I
15 reside at 6775 Craig Valley Drive in Newcastle, Virginia.
16 My property's not on the current route. However, my home is
17 located on Craig's Creek, which would be affected at the
18 headwaters should they put the pipeline in Craig.

PS3A2-166

19 The DEIS does not adequately address the human
20 toll of Mountain Valley Pipeline as it affects cultural
21 attachment and economic impact on all residents of Craig
22 County, Virginia. Craig County is a small rural community
23 with a population of 5,210 according to the 2013 census
24 data. Our school systems are 600 students, K through 12
25 under one roof.

PS3A2-166

As explained in the EIS; the MVP pipeline route includes one crossing of Craig Creek. Cultural Attachment is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The pipeline would only cross about two miles in Craig County. Impacts on forest are discussed in section 4.4; recreation in 4.8; and tourism in 4.9. Public services are also discussed in section 4.9.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 54% of our county is federal forestland, which
2 significantly impacts our economic development opportunities
3 in our community and limits our tax base. Agribusiness,
4 small business, recreation and tourism are the mainstay of
5 our economic base. We're accessible by two major highways,
6 and anyway, into Craig County, you have to traverse a
7 mountain.

8 Although we have part-time paid emergency service
9 personnel, the majority of our emergency response system is
10 made up by volunteer force. Our county is cash-strapped
11 with a property listed at 12.9%, which is higher than the
12 state rate of 11%. Many families in our community can trace
13 their roots in this community back several generations, and
14 desire to continue their family presence here for many more
15 generations.

16 Cultural attachment to place is very, very strong
17 to us. A community not solely limited to those along the
18 pipeline route. We have suffered lots of disenfranchisement
19 at the hands of MVP personnel. They have not adhered to the
20 letters. They have told one landowner particularly who's on
21 the Alternate 200 Route -- after surveying, one of the
22 contractors said that the route was not viable, could not be
23 built on his property, yet that is the route they put in
24 their DEIS. He's in the heart of sinkhole country there.

25 We've had trespassing of surveyors, the letters

PS3A2-167

PS3A2-167

Cultural Attachment is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

201

1 sent out to the landowners on the 200 Route had
2 misinformation in it. The Beckley Office had already closed
3 with no forwarding number, so they could not contact -- to
4 ask questions about when their surveyors were coming or what
5 they were going to do.

6 The letters that our landowners are receiving,
7 when they receive them -- because most of the time they have
8 not -- have a range of dates without specific information,
9 making it impossible for a working landowner to be there
10 when they're surveying their property. Lot of
11 disenfranchisement.

12 They had an Open House that was staffed by a
13 public relations individual. They could not even tell where
14 in our community these sub communities were. Could not find
15 them on the map and could not answer questions. It was a
16 sham; it was a real sham.

17 The routing of this pipeline within 200 feet of
18 family dwellings well within the incineration zone, and
19 limited consideration for cultural attachment issues have
20 been limited to a few regions of the county, when in fact
21 the attachment displace is countywide and experienced by all
22 residents whether they're directly on the pipeline route or
23 not.

24 Our infrastructure cannot accommodate building
25 this pipeline and operation of this pipeline, as evidenced

PS3A2-168

PS3A2-168

Cultural Attachment is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. See the response to comment PS1B1-10 regarding the potential impact radius. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency plans.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-168 | 1 by limited emergency response capability. We already know
cont'd | 2 that the fragile economy of Craig County will be severely
3 damaged, not helped by MVP, as evidenced by the May 2016
4 Key-Log Economic Impact Study. We know that MVP admits that
5 there would be limited environmental impact, and the parent
6 company EQT had significant finds related to groundwater
7 poisoning in Pennsylvania.

PS3A2-169 | 8 This will be their first attempt at building a
9 42" pipeline in environmentally fragile region. It is
10 understandable that residents are concerned over potential
11 issues with pipeline safety considering the past history of
12 EQT. We already know that there's history of water supply
13 damage of our county related to karst and gas exploration,
14 Paint Bank and ARCO, 1986. We won't be accessing the gas,
15 the effects of a boom and bust economy, resulting in
16 pipeline construction in a small community is ruinous to
17 fragile economies such as ours.

PS3A2-170 | 18 The current inaccurate misleading and incomplete
19 DEIS should be withdrawn. Our peace of mind and sense of
20 safety has already been shaken to the core. The human toll
21 to our small world community cannot be justified by building
22 this pipeline. Please do not allow the misuse of imminent
23 domain for corporate gains resulting in the destruction of
24 our community. I'll live in Americana at its best. These
25 people are real. Don't do this. It has no benefit to us.

PS3A2-169 See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding other existing 42-inch pipelines in mountainous terrain. See also the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A2-170 The draft EIS was not inaccurate. The final EIS revised the draft with newly filed information and responses to comments. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 203

1 And I appreciate you giving me a heads up in plenty of time.
2 I mean, we cannot expend people to the benefit of corporate
3 gain, we just can't. But thank you. I appreciate it.
4 Thank you all.

5 MS. PECKMAN: Kristin Peckman. First of all, as
6 I read it, there is no definition of purpose and need for
7 this pipeline as required by NEPA. EQT is selling some 60%
8 of its gas to another EQT subsidiary, so there's no record
9 of where the gas will ultimately go to. MVP is still
10 providing info to FERC, as well as altering the route since
11 the DEIS was issued, preventing the public from commenting
12 on the full content. FERC should junk this DEIS and start
13 over, since, from everything I've heard, the DEIS is faulty
14 anyway.

15 There is no assessment of climate change impacts.
16 The pipeline encourages fracking, leaks methane, which is a
17 more potent greenhouse gas than CO2, and of course, the gas
18 is ultimately burned.

19 Construction involves cutting down enormous
20 numbers of mature trees, both along the route and in
21 construction work areas. They're almost all in forests, I
22 read. Trees, which absorb CO2. These greenhouse gas costs
23 must be quantified.

24 What is MVP's record? How many 42" diameter
25 pipelines exist today? How many has MVP built? Where are

PS3A2-171

PS3A2-171

See section 1.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comment FA11-2 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to LA3-1 regarding additional filings by MVP.

PS3A2-172

PS3A2-172

Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.. See also the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing. See the response to comment FA15-5 regarding forest impacts.

PS3A2-173

PS3A2-173

See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding other existing 42-inch pipelines. See the response to comment IND184-1 regarding easements and compensation.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-173
cont'd

1 they? How can you say that the negative impacts are
2 minimal? How can you compare the value of gas to the value
3 of clean water? Property owners are receiving only a
4 one-time compensation. They should be compensated annually,
5 as long as the pipeline is active. And they should have
6 clearly stated recourse should problems occur down the road.

PS3A2-174

7 The requests to change the Jefferson National
8 Forests plan are outrageous. The forests were created
9 precisely to bring back the forests that were destroyed by
10 rampant development, the very type of activity that is being
11 proposed here. Preservation of old-growth trees and care
12 for clean water are an important part of the forest's
13 mandate.

PS3A2-175

14 MR. THOMPSON: Larry Thompson. I wanna make
15 comments objecting to the pipeline. We really love the land
16 that we have. We have 208 acres. The house was
17 built--original homestead--back in 1840. It's a log house.
18 We have a covered bridge on the property, built in 1919, one
19 of the only seven existing covered bridges in Virginia.
20 We object to the route through Giles County.
21 There are caves and underground aquifers in that area. On
22 our property we have at least three springs. There's never
23 been a well on our property. The water is from the springs.
24 The spring flows from the mountain, and the mountain is
25 where the pipeline will be.

PS3A2-174

The EIS provides a discussion of impacts on JNF throughout section 4; and especially in section 4.8.

PS3A2-175

Caves are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Cultural resources are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-176 | 1 MVP talks of mitigation, but how do you mitigate
2 a spring that stops flowing because of blasting? The
3 springs are not just water source for the people, but they
4 flow into Sinking Creek, they lower the temperature, and
5 they allow the 24" rainbow trout to live there, to continue
6 living. How do you mitigate the aquifer damage? How do you
7 cool down the creek once the spring stops?

PS3A2-177 | 8 Our property backs up to Jefferson National
9 Forest. We are against putting the route through Jefferson
10 National Forest, cutting the pathway through there. We feel
11 that once the precedent has been set, that other utilities
12 can follow and we have no idea what those might be, but they
13 can use that same route, use the same strategy to go through
14 there again. The impact will increase. It might be
15 powerlines, it might be oil lines, we don't know what it'll
16 be, but we are against going through Jefferson National
17 Forest.

18 Quite honestly, I have no optimism that the
19 comments I make here tonight are gonna make a difference,
20 but I do have a dream that one day my son and daughter will
21 be good stewards of the land that we are gonna pass onto
22 them, and I want them to know that I have done everything I
23 can to stop this project from going through, so that they'll
24 know that, you know, November 2016, I was here doing what I
25 could do to stop it. That's all I've got to say.

PS3A2-176 See EIS sections 2, 4.1, and 4.2 about blasting. Water resources are discussed in section 4.3. See the responses to comment IND277-6 regarding damages and responsibility.

PS3A2-177 Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

206

1 MS. CHANDLER: My name is Kathy E. Chandler.
2 Thank you. My property, where my family and myself live is
3 between Milepost 245 and 246, between Mill Creek and Green
4 Hollow Drive on Bent Mountain in Virginia, in Roanoke
5 County. We are personally affected by this pipeline as the
6 corridor cuts our property in half.

PS3A2-178

7 The Department of Forestry visited us initially
8 when we evaluated the property to even purchase it, and
9 admired the variety of trees that we have, the number of
10 mature trees that we have, and considered harvesting some,
11 and we wanted to leave the forest as it is. This intended
12 corridor goes a half of mile of cutting right through our
13 property in the middle. It's going to displace wildlife, it
14 crosses many water crossings, which I'll come back to, and
15 renders almost half of our 100 acres unusable when this
16 corridor gets put in place. Which means half of our real
17 estate will be unusable, and those lands will be
18 land-locked. There's no other access for them.

PS3A2-179

19 We're concerned we won't be able to get
20 homeowners' insurance, much less resell our home someday.
21 Sadly, we're at a 90-degree angle where they also wanna take
22 all of Green Hollow Drive as an access road, to get into the
23 pipeline corridor permanently. And this access road would
24 be one-mile long, at which we live almost at the farthest
25 end of the road. There's no other entrance in or out of

PS3A2-178

See the response to comment IND362-3 regarding use of property. Water quality and streams are discussed in section 4.3.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PS3A2-179

See the responses to comments IND12-1 and IND 12-2 regarding property values and insurance. Traffic is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS. Mountain Valley would maintain access for landowners.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

207

PS3A2-179
cont'd

1 Green Hollow.
2 So that forevermore, we'll see pipeline activity
3 and pipeline people and support personnel and equipment in
4 our daily coming and going. I have a great concern that
5 I'll never get to work, kids to school, 911 services in and
6 out, simply road construction, if you've stood there and
7 watched people say "stop" and "start" and "slow" during the
8 construction phase, particularly of this pipeline. It will
9 markedly affect what we can do with our family.

PS3A2-180

10 It will take out a quarter mile of cattle fencing
11 and a cattle paddock along the entrance when they widen this
12 road 50 feet from center and damage a major water crossing
13 where our driveway goes through with a culvert. When they
14 cross that water, they'll impact a strong creek that feeds
15 30 acres of wetlands, and I've had a wetland sign -- just
16 look at that -- that said it will essentially drench drain
17 that wetlands and kill it. It won't exist any longer.

18 Our property value can't be mitigated with any
19 amount of money. We built that home, moving a timber-frame
20 barn that was dated 1892, hand-smoked into the timbers, and
21 a log barn from the 1800s. The dynamiting which goes

PS3A2-181

22 through the corridor is a couple hundred feet from our well.
23 If it fractures our well, we won't have any personal water.

24 I have children. We live in a blast zone where
25 there's no running for safety. If it blows up, it blows up,

PS3A2-180

See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding cattle. Mountain Valley would have to compensate the landowner for the loss of ranching income caused by pipeline construction. Water resources, streams, and wetlands are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-181

Property values are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See also the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

208

PS3A2-181
cont'd

1 and that's the end of us. We live in a rural community
2 where they're allowed to use thinner pipe. It's like buying
3 a trash bag. You don't have to use the sturdy pipe like you
4 do in a more highly populated area.

5 We've been taken advantage of legally by a
6 private corporation, using Roanoke County attorney and
7 police force to side-step the due process of having a court
8 date with MVP. We've had police protection pulled from us
9 during survey activity. We've had court dates set and reset

PS3A2-182

10 and then they ambushed us on October 10th when the courts
11 were not open, told us to not interfere with their survey
12 activities and 40 people came past just me to enter our
13 property and complete surveying through that whole half-mile
14 corridor, when we had a court date pending on October 27th.

15 When they finished on our property that day,
16 collecting all their data, they unsuited the court case. I
17 feel like my property rights were violated and my due
18 process. Our wetlands shed over a hundred acres of water
19 that feeds into the Roanoke River, and half of Roanoke
20 County's reservoir. We've been unethically entered by MVP
21 on at least three events with no notice whatsoever, for
22 survey activity.

23 We've been deceived twice when they said they
24 were going to enter a neighbor's property and they had our
25 maps and told one of our neighbor's "we're going there

PS3A2-182

The statement regarding Mountain Valley's surveyors is noted.
Waterbodies and wetlands are discussed in section 4.3.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 next." And had I not been there, they would have entered.
2 I found them entering twice on my own, deceptively saying
3 they were going to a neighbor's property, and I photographed
4 them on mine. Just a week ago, I found people leaving the
5 creek bed and coming uphill into my property. And I videoed
6 them.

PS3A2-183

7 The whole specter of being in a two-pronged
8 90-degree angle of an access road and the corridor is more
9 than most folks. Our property value stands to be
10 diminished, an extreme lack of equity for our home and our
11 safety and our water.

PS3A2-183

See the responses to comments IND12-1 regarding property values. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3A2-184

12 MR. KRZYSTON: Joseph Krzyston. So the proposed
13 amendments to the plan for the Jefferson National
14 Forest--and it doesn't cross my property, by the
15 way--proposed amendments for the plan for the National
16 Forest are contrary to the purpose of a National Forest.
17 Amendment 1 is troublesome, you know, instead of old-growth
18 forest and successional forests, FERC proposes a 500-foot
19 wide utility corridor adjacent to the Appalachian Trail
20 through an inventoried roadless area and immediately
21 adjacent to two wilderness areas, Peters Mountain Wilderness
22 and Brush Mountain Wilderness.

PS3A2-184

The EIS provides a discussion of impacts on the JNF throughout section 4; and especially in section 4.8. See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide right-of-way on NFS lands.

23 This amendment would completely fragment the
24 forest and invite installation of the second largest natural
25 gas pipeline immediately adjacent to the proposed pipeline.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-185 | 1 Utility corridors should be co-located with existing utility
2 corridors outside or inside the forest. This amendment is
3 absolutely unacceptable.

4 I've done some reading about FERC, about the way
5 the process works and--with no offense intended, of course,
6 the people that work for FERC -- it doesn't seem right the

PS3A2-186 | 7 way it works. I think it's frankly a little bit suspicious
8 that pipelines almost never get, you know, turned down for
9 approval, you know. If you're approving everything, then
10 why do you exist? You know, I just don't this is right. I
11 don't think this is equitable. A lot of people are getting
12 hurt by a pipeline of really, really, really questionable
13 legitimacy in terms of structural aspects. And I'm very
14 uncomfortable and I don't know. I don't think these are the
15 principles upon which our country was founded.

16 I just -- I don't think it's right that these
17 people don't really have much of a chance in this fight.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. MCDEARMON: Richard McDearmon, III. One, I
PS3A2-187 | 20 think there should be more consideration when passing
21 through the Jefferson National Forest. I think that there
22 should
23 be -- all pipelines originally passing through the Jefferson
24 National Forest should be considered because multiple
25 pipelines equals multiple crossings against public land and

PS3A2-185 Collocation with existing utilities is discussed in section 3.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-186 To fulfill its obligations under the NGA, the Commission authorizes natural gas infrastructure to serve markets. We explain how the Commission makes decisions in section 1.2.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-187 Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-187
cont'd

1 I believe that particularly the Mountain Valley Pipeline is
2 for private use and it should not be allowed to cross
3 through public land.

PS3A2-188

4 I would also like to talk about specifically
5 about Mile Marker 253.5. My residence is just below this.
6 I do believe there should be a considered shift from this to
7 a less populated ridge. Before the environmental impact was
8 submitted, a survey was not completed on this property and I
9 do not believe that it has been properly taken into
10 consideration.

11 Portions of this ridge are less than 30 feet wide
12 with a permanent right-of-way of 50 feet and a construction
13 right-of-way of 100 feet, I do not think that the proper
14 survey has been taken to show how much devastation would
15 occur to the land and possibly to my residence. This is a
16 mini-mountain top removal.

17 In addition to that, I don't think there has been
18 enough study into the samplings of rock structures and other
19 terrain considerations, as far as grade, between the 250 and
20 255 Mile points. I think there needs to be more
21 consideration about potential structures that would have to
22 be blasted and the consequences that they would have on
23 local water sources. Water is the most valuable resource
24 that I do not think that current surveys have taken into
25 consideration.

PS3A2-188

See the response to FA11-12 regarding project route variations.
See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting. See the
response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016 212

1 Not only could possible blasting collapse my
2 well, but many in the neighborhood. And without public
3 water, I would have to resort to purchasing water.

PS3A2-189 4 In addition, Mile Marker 253 has many old-growth
5 trees, which lead to the diversity of the wildlife, as well
6 as the tree species in the area. Also pertaining to 253.5,
PS3A2-190 7 with the steep terrain that has not been properly surveyed,
8 I worry about additional erosion.

PS3A2-191 9 Actual demand for public use and imminent domain,
10 I think need to be looked at more. I personally believe
11 that a large majority of the gas that would roll through
12 this proposed pipeline is for export and imminent domain
13 should not be used to steal private land for private use.

PS3A2-192 14 Another comment on this so-called public meeting,
15 I believe that these closed meetings that I'm participating
16 in right now should be open to the public, so that the
17 community can have a conversation about the project. And
18 let us as a community decide what is best, one way or the
19 other.

PS3A2-193 20 I believe that there should be additional
21 consideration and study on property values and consideration
22 of future expansion of additional pipelines or potential
23 transportation of other fluids including oil, water.
24 Water's the most important resource to everyone.
25 I've got a bottle with me right now. I carry

PS3A2-189 See the response to comment FA15-5 regarding forest impacts.

PS3A2-190 Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS3A2-191 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding the fact that MVP was not designed for export.

PS3A2-192 See the response to comment LA2-1 regarding the draft EIS comment sessions. The sessions were open to the public, and comments were placed into the FERC's public record.

PS3A2-193 See the responses to comments IND12-1 regarding property values. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS
PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-193
cont'd

1 this bottle and about twelve other bottles with me in all my
2 travels. That's how important my water is to me. And it's
3 not just my water. Across the entire route is the life
4 source of everything. More consideration needs to occur in
5 studying this project with potential devastation of all our
6 water sources, because water is life, and without water,
7 we're not here. Thank you, gentlemen.

PS3A2-194

8 MS. KELLEY-DEARING: It's Bridget Kelley-Dearing.
9 The Mountain Valley Pipeline will cross the headwaters of
10 the Murray River and Bath County by crossing the Calfpasture
11 River. My community in Lexington, Virginia gets all of our
12 drinking water from the Murray River, so I strongly oppose
13 this pipeline. The DEIS does not comply with the EPA's

PS3A2-195

14 recent and final guidelines regarding GHG emissions and the
15 federal agency's requirement to follow them.

PS3A2-196

16 I'm also concerned about the spraying of
17 pesticides on the path of the pipeline, contaminating water
18 supplies and killing our ecosystem alongside the pipeline.
19 The DEIS does not properly address this. Discussion of
20 crews cutting trees and plant growth along the route is
21 completely disingenuous as anyone that tries to keep their
22 yard in control knows. Will the MVP have full-time crews
23 cutting on the route? Will growth be controlled by
24 pesticide spray? I've been told no.
25 If it is, how much? What about overspray? What

PS3A2-194 Water supplies are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3A2-195 Climate change and GHGs are discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.

PS3A2-196 See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding pesticides and herbicides.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161103-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/03/2016		214
PS3A2-196 cont'd	1 about spray entering creeks and rivers? I want answers on 2 all aspects of pesticide spray. If EQT continues to say 3 growth will be cut, what assurance do we have this will 4 happen and who will monitor or regulate this? Does the 5 spraying of pesticides meet the Federal Clean Water Act? 6 How many pounds of spray will be used on each application?	
PS3A2-197	7 How many regulators will be employed monitoring 8 this pipeline, and monitoring that growth is only cut and 9 that no spray is being used? Are these regulators funded? 10 Who pays for the regulators? You cannot build in karst	
PS3A2-198	11 regions--or so I've been told--so I want the DEIS to address 12 why it's running over karst in many regions through 13 southwest Virginia. 14 In Ironto, Virginia near Mile Marker 234 the 15 pipeline is within a few miles of a giant well-known cave 16 called Dixie Caverns. How is this possible? How does the 17 DEIS answer to this? On Mile Marker 244 on Bent Marker, the	
PS3A2-199	18 Mountain Valley Pipeline route runs through an area that is 19 known to flood. And a rare turtle lives there. 20 Why is the Mountain Valley Pipeline allowed 21 through wetlands and conservation areas? The people of	
PS3A2-200	22 Virginia deserve renewable energy now. I look forward to 23 the Supreme Court if this pipeline is allowed to go through 24 due to imminent domain being illegal unless there is a clear 25 need. Currently through the Synapse Report that was	

PS3A2-197 See the response to comment IND152-1 regarding our third-party construction monitoring program.

PS3A2-198 Karst terrain and caves are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PS3A2-199 Water resources, streams, and wetlands are discussed in section 4.3.2 of the EIS. Conservation areas are discussed in section 4.8. The final EIS includes a revised discussion of flash flooding. Special status species are discussed in section 4.7.

PS3A2-200 See the response to comment IND40-1 regarding renewable energy. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. Non-environmental FERC staff may address the Synapse report in the Project Order.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3A2-201

1 recently supplied to FERC, it's clear that the gas supply's
2 currently sufficient through 2030.
3 If FERC doesn't agree with the Synapse Report,
4 then they need to prove the report wrong. In detail. The
5 report was written by well-known scientists and people of
6 equal credentials to FERC and they need to prove why they
7 believe it's wrong. Not say "we believe it's wrong." They
8 need to show that it's not correct because peoples' lands,
9 farms and businesses are being taken through imminent domain
10 and that is not legal in Virginia, unless there's a proven
11 need. I want renewable energy now. I strongly oppose the
12 Mountain Valley Pipeline. That's it.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PS3A2-201

Non-environmental FERC staff may review the Synapse report.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3A – Sheraton Hotel Roanoke, VA– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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

216

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 David Voigtsberger

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B - 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
11 Peterstown Elementary School
12 108 College Drive
13 Peterstown, West Virginia 24963
14 Thursday, November 3, 2016

15
16 A public verbal comment session on the Draft EIS was
17 held, pursuant to notice. starting at 5 p.m.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 2

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (5:00 p.m.)

3 MS. MCWHORTER: My name is Virginia D. McWhorter,

4 M-c-W-h-o-r-t-e-r, M-c-W-h-o-r-t-e-r. My husband and I live

5 at 497 Blue Grass Trail, Newport Virginia 24128. We live

6 0.22 miles from the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline route.

PS3B1-1 | 7 No one from Mountain Valley Pipeline has ever been to visit

8 us concerning the blast zone, our water source and our other

9 issues.

10 Our home built in 1875 has a historical name --

11 Willow Springs and the spring is the source of our water.

12 While the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline is not on our

13 property it is in our backyard the Village of Newport, Giles

14 County and State of Virginia. You have heard all the issues

15 concerning the Draft EIS time and time again.

PS3B1-2 | 16 The recent explosion in Alabama, the recent

17 earthquake in Oklahoma, the Dakota events and locally the

18 unkempt 12 inch pipeline over Peter's Mountain must remind

19 you of the serious unintended consequences that can result

20 from your decisions on this proposed route. There are

21 compromises that warrant further study. Please consider

22 hybrid alternate 1A.

23 As negatives it is longer, it does cross the New

24 River but many of the factors are in the positive column.

25 The negatives will add to the cost but the cost of the

PS3B1-1 The pipeline would be more than 1,600 feet from the commentor's parcel. Mountain Valley has not contacted the commentor because the commentor is not an impacted or adjacent landowner. Willow Springs, your historic house, was recorded as site #35-41-61, within the Greater Newport Rural Historic District. This house is about 1,820 feet away from the pipeline. The Greater Newport Rural Historic District is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3B1-2 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Earthquakes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Section 3 of the EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 3

1 current proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline route incurred by
2 individuals, our company, by you as FERC and the Pipeline
3 Company investors will in the long-run be greater than the
4 cost to study and construct hybrid alternative 1A.

PS3B1-3 5 Additionally the amendments are unnecessary at
6 this time. Facts show that demand could be provided with a
7 smaller diameter pipeline and currently there is no need for
8 utility corridors. These amendments should be addressed in
9 a revised Draft EIS to allow greater public input.

PS3B1-4 10 As compromises evolve why not also consider some
11 joint construction usage of a corridor for Mountain Valley
12 Pipeline and the Atlantic Coast Pipeline along I-77,
13 Virginia State Highway 460 or I-77, I-64, 581 or some
14 combination of highways. They are already public lands that
15 serve everyone.

16 In closing the size and route of the proposed
17 Mountain Valley Pipeline cause great concern over safety,
18 cultural, environmental and water issues. Thank you for
19 meeting with us, Virginia McWhorter.

PS3B1-5 20 MR. COVELLI: Jordan Covelli, C-o-v-e-l-l-i. I
21 support the construction and operation of the Mountain
22 Valley Pipeline Project and encourage FERC to approve the
23 project. In particular, because of logistical rationality,
24 economic impact and the implications for future growth and
25 development -- because of these reasons I encourage the

PS3B1-3 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1 regarding Amendments to the LRMP.

PS3B1-4 Combining the MVP and ACP was addressed in section 3 of the EIS. The EIS provides a discussion of water resources in section 4.3, environmental resources throughout section 4, and cultural resources in section 4.10.

PS3B1-5 Comment noted.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

4

1 approval of the MVP.

2 Specifically, the Mountain Valley Pipeline will
3 transport the abundant natural gas resources from the
4 Marcellus and Utica regions in West Virginia to the growing
5 demand markets in the mid-Atlantic and southeastern regions
6 of the United States.

7 In addition FERC's Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement seems to note Mountain Valley Pipeline's
9 willingness to work with all stakeholders in designing a
10 route with the least impact on landowners and the
11 environment.

12 Second -- in terms of economic impact -- the
13 construction of the project will support thousands of jobs
14 and significant economic activity throughout the region and
15 will generate a significant amount of tax revenue for local
16 governments to support local schools, roads and other
17 important priorities.

18 According to an economic benefit report the
19 development of this project could result in more than 500
20 million dollars in construction spending, 4,000 direct and
21 indirect jobs and more than 40 million in tax revenues for
22 the state of West Virginia. Once the project is operational
23 West Virginia counties along the route will continue to
24 receive property tax revenues generating an estimated 17
25 million dollars to county governments.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 Finally, the implications for future growth and
2 development -- the operation of new pipeline capacity should
3 also help spur additional natural gas development in West
4 Virginia which has the potential to create additional jobs
5 and economic activity.

6 In conclusion, because of the Mountain Valley
7 Pipeline's logistical rationality, economic impact and
8 implications for future growth and development, I encourage
9 the FERC to approve the project thank you.

PS3B1-6

10 MR. MARTIN: Michael Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n. I have
11 only one point about the pipeline that concerns me and that
12 is I hear that they use two different thicknesses of wall
13 thickness for the pipe. And in my area, which is low
14 population density, they will use user wall thickness --
15 less wall thickness.

16 I don't feel this is right for me to be put at
17 more risk than other people. An analogy would be that I
18 have welding tanks I use, I have propane tanks -- they are
19 not different than anybody else that a populated area would
20 have -- so that is my only point.

21 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm Jonathan, J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n
22 Dean McLaughlin M-c-L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n who lives in Monroe
23 County. And before I lived in Monroe County I lived in
24 Montgomery County, Virginia. As a 9 year old boy scout I
25 hiked the Appalachian Trail for the first time. Although my

PS3B1-6

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. DOT regulates pipeline design, including wall thickness, as explained in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 6

1 family has always lived in southern Appalachia I was not
2 aware that this existed and I was thrilled that there was a
3 trail to be walked along the mountain tops all the way from
4 Georgia to Maine.

PS3B1-7 5 But I am only concerned about the part of the
6 trail which Mountain Valley Pipeline wants to cross now with
7 a 500 foot corridor -- an energy corridor. To me that this
8 is anathema how it will disrupt the Appalachian Trail which
9 is part of America's heritage to be interrupted the view
10 shed and the Jefferson National Forest so a private company
11 can put a pipeline.

PS3B1-8 12 This is a pipeline whose capacity is not needed
13 to serve the southeast at this time. In fact there are
14 current pipelines that will carry enough gas to serve the
15 area that Mountain Valley Pipeline says they want to hook up
16 to until 2030. What I believe is happening is that once
17 Peter's Mountain where the Appalachian Trail is breached --

PS3B1-9 18 it's a quick run to the sea and there will be a gas
19 liquefaction plant built on the coast of North Carolina and
20 it will be built non-union and it will export gas to Europe
21 to pull Europe out of the Russia hole which is where they
22 find themselves today.

PS3B1-10 23 I have sympathy for the Europeans because of the
24 bed they have made for themselves but I don't believe that
25 my county and my cultural heritage in southern Appalachia

PS3B1-7 The MVP pipeline would cross under the ANST using a bore; see section 4.8 of the EIS. See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide corridor on NFS lands.

PS3B1-8 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need. Existing systems as an alternative to the MVP was evaluated in section 3 of the EIS.

PS3B1-9 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3B1-10 See the response to comment PS1B2-34 regarding jobs in West Virginia.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-10 | 1 should be impeded for gain. I think it is just part of the
cont'd 2 rise and fascism in America today. It is the whole ball of

3 wax.

4 They holler "jobs, jobs, jobs". I was an iron
5 worker and a boiler maker AFL-CIO for 43 years. I worked
6 70,000 hours. I know about the jobs it will bring and will
7 not bring. I know where the welds will fail on this
8 pipeline and where they will not fail because of my vast
9 experience.

10 Intellectually I am decimated by what is going to
11 transpire if FERC continues on. Thank you very much.

12 MR. CHLEPAS: First name is Constantine,
13 C-o-n-s-t-a-n-t-i-n-e. Last name is Chlepas, C-h-l-e-p-a-s,

PS3B1-11 | 14 a good ole' Irish name -- Okay water -- the DEIS has no
15 karst mitigation plan equal to the magnitude of the karst
16 terrain in Monroe County. West Virginia multiple geologists
17 recommend that there must be an independent hydro-geological
18 study for Peter's Mountain and all of Monroe County that
19 will be impacted on the proposed MVP route.

PS3B1-12 | 20 Pollinators and herbicides -- the DEIS claims
21 that MVP will not spray herbicides on the pipeline route
22 without permission of individual landowners. This would not
23 address the deadly problem. As a professional aviary owner
24 and honeybee breeder with extensive knowledge of pollinator
25 populations I am aware that the herbicides applied within

PS3B1-11 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO34-1 regarding hydrogeological studies.

PS3B1-12 See the response to comment IND76-1 regarding bees.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

	20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016	8
PS3B1-12 cont'd	1 five miles of radius of the aviary will still kill a colony 2 of bees. 3 Bees routinely fly up to five miles away from the 4 hive. The residue from the herbicides are brought back to 5 the hive and introduced to the other bees. This builds up 6 and will kill the colony. Herbicide defoliants will destroy 7 a perfectly balanced bee and wildlife habitat that this 8 agricultural community relies on.	
PS3B1-13	9 Pipeline explosion -- the DEIS states that there 10 is a fire station every 8 miles along the pipeline route. 11 In the event of an explosion these small local 12 volunteer-staffed fire stations will not have the 13 specialized equipment or training to fight one of these 14 massive disasters. It would take hours perhaps up to a half 15 a day for specialized equipment and firefighters to come to 16 our aid. 17 The inferno could cause a blast of the size that 18 would cut off escape routes in our tiny valleys. Instantly 19 the huge volume of ambers spewed by the burning fire storm 20 would expand exponentially due to the massive fuel provided 21 by our heavy timber and hay fields. This would turn our 22 loved ones, friends, churches, schools and farms to ashes.	
PS3B1-14	23 Work stoppage exit plan -- there's no mention in 24 the DEIS about what will happen if MVP files for bankruptcy 25 before completing construction. What protection would our	

PS3B1-13 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PS3B1-14 See the response to comment IND28-3 regarding financial responsibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 9

PS3B1-14 cont'd
1 community have? Who would pay for the clean-up and
2 potential environmental catastrophe that this would cause?
3 No discussion of a bond to be placed.

PS3B1-15
4 The DEIS does not address the exit plan. What is
5 the exit plan when the pipeline becomes obsolete within the
6 end of the methane supply as few as a short six years away?
7 Will MVP pay to remove the pipeline? Will it be used to
8 transfer harmful chemicals? What would the local landowners
9 have with regard it being what would be transported in them?
10 Would they be left and become a -- excuse me -- that's it,
11 basically that you know if they are left they could rust out
12 and add more environmental problems.

PS3B1-16
13 MS. HALL: Shirley Hall. Okay I had sent in
14 during the scoping period a lot of comments and one that
15 really I think for Monroe County is very important is the
16 steep slope inside the slope. And in the first Draft that
17 MVP sent out they had determined that development on slopes
18 -- on route alternative 1 was the first route they chose,
19 represented insurmountable construction challenges as well
20 as a high risk of slope failure and pipeline slips once the
21 pipeline was to be in operation.

22 So I had asked them to compare all the other
23 routes as they did it to that first one. So I actually had
24 a chart -- can we leave you anything or not?

25 MS. MARDINEY: Yes.

PS3B1-15 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. The pipeline is only permitted to transport natural gas.

PS3B1-16 Steep slopes are addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-16
cont'd

1 MS. HALL: Okay and when they compared the first
2 one to the second one they still had 120 miles of steep
3 slope and 122 miles of side slope. So my comments were also
4 they had an Appendix K and Appendix N1. Now K listed the
5 steep slopes along the MVP by county. And then the other
6 one listing soils and soil limitations in acres next to it
7 also had the slope percentage and they were vastly
8 different.

9 They were nowhere near each other as far as the
10 slope. So for Monroe County I would just ask them to maybe
11 look at what we have here. We have karst, we have -- I mean
12 we have a lot of things that could go wrong so we just would
13 like to make sure they check everything.

14 MS. HENRITZ: Suzie, z-i-e- Henritz
15 H-e-n-r-i-t-z, got to have the z's in there right, it's the
16 21st Century. Dear Miss Bose I have multiple concerns
17 regarding the recently released DEIS for the MVP Project.

PS3B1-17

18 The pipeline would cross primarily
19 undeveloped rural agricultural and forested lands including
20 hundreds of streams and wetlands and several major rivers to
21 deliver up to 2 billion cubic feet per day of gas from
22 fracking operations in the Appalachian basins, Marcellus and
23 Utica shale formations to the southeastern and mid-Atlantic
24 markets to be shipped overseas.

25 Although it would have a major impact on West

PS3B1-17

See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export. See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

	20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016	11
PS3B1-17 cont'd	1 Virginia, there will be no gas provided for the citizens -- 2 only destruction of property and water facilities. FERC has 3 not demonstrated the need for the pipeline or public 4 benefits as part of the NEPA process. FERC's failure to	
PS3B1-18	5 comply with NEPA's purpose and need requirement is 6 especially problematic because MVP would have significant 7 adverse impacts to public lands and would require the taking 8 of private property through the use of eminent domain.	PS3B1-18 The EIS complies with NEPA. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.
PS3B1-19	9 The DEIS lacks critical environmental 10 information. NEPA requires agencies to take a hard look at 11 the environmental impacts of the proposed project and to 12 make that information available to the public. Here, FERC 13 released the DEIS despite the absence of information 14 necessary to assess the impacts of the project on a wide 15 range of resources including streams, wetlands, threatened 16 and endangered species, cultural resources and recreational 17 resources such as the Appalachian Trail. 18 FERC has said that MVP can submit the missing 19 information before construction begins. This is unjust. 20 The public cannot rely on FERC's assurance that such impacts 21 will be successfully mitigated. We the people are not 22 collateral damage along with our land to private 23 corporations and federal government agencies who seek only 24 to enrich themselves in the name of greed at the expense of 25 the people and the environment.	PS3B1-19 See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment IND196-2 regarding pending information in the draft EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 12

PS3B1-20 1 Monroe County is not safer building a pipeline,
2 not only because of the dangers to the environment but also
3 it is too risky for the pipeline itself. We have karst
4 which poses severe constraints on engineering construction
5 and potential collapse. Hydro-geology is another concern.
6 Increased risk of groundwater contamination during and after
7 pipeline construction where surface water from steep slopes
8 enters karst aquifers.

PS3B1-21 9 At the base of the groundwater re-charge areas
10 they are vulnerable. Many people in Monroe County depend on
11 springs and wells for our water source. Once these are
12 contaminated we have nothing. Water is life. We have steep
13 slopes and weak soils. MVP construction will accelerate
14 run-off and erosion, threatening the integrity of the
15 pipeline and the people along with our beloved environment.

PS3B1-22 16 This DEIS belongs in the fiction section of the
17 library. It is not factual. All the excellent comments
18 that have been submitted to FERC have basically been
19 overlooked and disregarded. It has been rubber stamped.
20 The process is a sham. The people and the environment are
21 collateral damage. This is not acceptable. We will
22 continue to fight on since all we have to lose is
23 everything.

24 MS. BROWN: Anne A-n-n-e Anne Brown. It was
25 recently been disclosed that the MVP proposal to construct a

PS3B1-20 Karst is addressed in section 4.1, groundwater in section 4.3, and surface water in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND179-2 regarding contamination.

PS3B1-21 Steep slopes are discussed in section 4.1. Soils are addressed in section 4.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND70-1 regarding erosion.

PS3B1-22 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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 13

1 42 inch pipeline across our region is only part of a larger
2 plan to construct a 500 foot utility corridor along the
3 route which the pipeline would open up. Presumably, once
4 MVP had their pipeline in there would be no effective way
5 that the people and communities affected by this would be
6 able to effectively oppose expanding the route into the
7 corridor.

8 My objections to this whole thing are many.
9 First of all the unnecessary expansion of infrastructure for
10 an industry that is in decline -- we will always need some
11 gas but the need for gas is in decline. To waste our
12 resources on this pipeline and damage the environment the
13 way it would is just not acceptable to me.

14 The fact that the current fracked gas
15 infrastructure is adequate to meet the declining need of
16 fossil fuels argues against the need for yet another
17 pipeline. This pipeline would cause the destruction of
18 pristine land which is crucial to the development of our
19 tourism industry. It would disrupt the delicate water table
20 and the resultant loss of livable land would mean that many
21 of us would have to leave our land because many people in
22 Summers County are dependent on wells.

23 It would cause contamination of water with the
24 pipe leakage. It wouldn't leak necessarily right away but
25 these pipes leak. We have known that from previous states

PS3B1-23 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest. See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS3B1-24 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing.

PS3B1-25 After pipeline installation underground, the right-of-way would be restored and revegetated. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3B1-26 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks. See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides. Organic farms are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016		14
PS3B1-26 cont'd	1 that have had to deal with the problem of poisoning their 2 water. This would cause a loss of our organic growing 3 industry. I am an organic farmer and I am just now getting 4 to the point where I am making money growing organic 5 vegetables.	
PS3B1-27	6 If this pipeline goes through it will disrupt the 7 water table -- our hydro-electric -- I mean our -- the 8 people who specialize in the flow of water have demonstrated 9 that the water can go sideways, 40 miles. So even though 10 this isn't going through my land it would go through a 11 neighbor's land that is in my water table shed.	
PS3B1-28	12 The danger of explosions is far greater with this 13 42 inch pipe than the ones that have already been exploding 14 for smaller pipes. Most recently there was an explosion in 15 Alabama that killed somebody and damaged some other people 16 -- that was a little pipeline. This is a much bigger 17 pipeline.	
PS3B1-29	18 Our geologists have said very clearly our terrain 19 will not secure -- our terrain cannot guarantee that the 20 pipeline is not going to shift and fracture. Thanks. 21 MR. PEREGOY: Timothy Peregoy, T-i-m-o-t-h-y 22 P-e-r-e-g-o-y. Okay I'm an organic farmer of 26 years, a 23 teacher and an ecologist. I have been rambling around here 24 for 20-some years, we have 8 rivers and the water is a way 25 of life for people here. It's pretty simple -- if you ruin	
PS3B1-30		

- PS3B1-27 Groundwater is addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.
- PS3B1-28 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.
- PS3B1-29 Geology is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS.
- PS3B1-30 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-30 | 1 the water you will ruin people's lives, there's no doubt.
cont'd 2 The West Virginia GMP space on eco-tourism --
3 people float, people boat, people hike, people do it all and
4 they do it all around the water or in water sheds or
5 estuaries of the water and that's what they do. People farm
6 -- as an agri-educator we have one of the burgeoning local
7 food programs in the region. West Virginia is behind in a
8 lot of things which a lot of people think that they can
9 sometimes beguile Appalachians.

PS3B1-31 | 10 But really we have a burgeoning food program but
11 it is based on the water. You can't feed people without
12 water. You can't feed people without high quality water and
13 so really it will run the eco-tourism, it will ruin the farm
14 land and I have been to Washington County. Have you ever
15 been to Washington County, PA?
16 You will probably want to go if you are sitting
17 here because that county has already been ruined. Penn
18 State University is a Pennsylvania Association of
19 Sustainable Agriculture has been trying to help Washington
20 County for a few years. And Washington County doesn't even
21 have the same geologic karst that we have. They have a
22 pretty normal structure but it ran over 2.5 miles in one
23 lady's organic farm and ruined it and ruined her whole
24 livelihood and certification.
25 And it is not even the same type of karst that we

PS3B1-31 Farming is discussed in sections 2, 4.2, and 4.8. Tourism is addressed in section 4.9.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 have here. Here we are running it, we are running it, we
2 run it and you never know where it is going to pop up
3 because that's the way water gets up here. You know that's
4 why a lot of people here have a gravitational fed spring
5 because the water is moving around and it bubbles out of the
6 ground and you never really know where it is going to come
7 out.

8 Other contaminants are the same issue. The
9 contaminant follow the water, people don't know where it is
10 going to come out. Really I have the FERC statements, the
11 books -- I have barely had time to go through them before I
12 had to lend them out. One of the ridiculousities of the plan
13 is the manual shut-off valves and the USFS forest service
14 roads.

15 Once again I have got to ask you if you have ever
16 been up on Keeney's Knob or any of these places in the
17 winter time. If it blows the mechanical engineered gate and
18 you can't get to the manual shut-off valve which some of
19 them are over 9 miles away until USFS road -- I'm in great
20 shape and I have hiked thousands of miles. I would have to
21 put on a pair of snowshoes to get up in there in the middle
22 of winter time shutting one of those gate valves off I can
23 tell you that.

24 So really I have got to say it just doesn't make
25 any sense pumping gas through several states including our

PS3B1-32

PS3B1-32

See the response to comment PS1B1-15 regarding the MLVs.

PS3B1-33

PS3B1-33

See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-33
cont'd

1 state, to get to somebody else's state to sell the gas to
2 somebody else has no -- there's no positive anything for
3 West Virginians. A few people may sell their rights
4 underground and really that's not a positive. They think
5 that's a positive when they are getting that paycheck and
6 all their other neighbors think it is a negative.
7 So really it has done nothing but this -- create
8 community controversy. Here in Appalachia we are community
9 -- because it is easy to be community in rural places. It
10 is harder to be community in the suburbs -- it is harder to
11 have rapport and dialogue and have real communication in
12 other places. It's not hard here you know.

PS3B1-34

13 And so it is just pretty doggone simple. We have
14 8 rivers in this water shed. We have thousands of acres of
15 tributaries -- there's no way that people can control
16 contaminated water, it's not possible. I have read about
17 all bodies of water and you can control them in places, you
18 can build empowerment dams, you can do this, you can do
19 that.

PS3B1-35

20 And I've been to a compressor station. You and I
21 couldn't even if you were there and I was here and that
22 compressor station was running full blast you can't even
23 have a conversation. Not possible. The noise pollution

PS3B1-36

24 then when they are trucking all of these trucks in -- the
25 state of West Virginia is so poor they can't even keep up

PS3B1-34

Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3B1-35

See the response to comment IND439-3 regarding noise at compressor stations.

PS3B1-36

Noise is addressed in section 4.11.2 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND288-3 regarding road repairs.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-36
cont'd

1 with their road infrastructure now.

2 With the amount of trucks that go on a road -- I
3 saw them in Washington County, they belly the road. They
4 take out the roads.

5 MS. YOUNG: My name is Jill Young. I am the
6 co-owner of Zenith Springs Farm. We live in Zenith, West
7 Virginia. The reason we live in Zenith, West Virginia
8 having moved 11 years ago from Seattle, Washington -- we
9 came in search of water. And we searched up and down the
10 eastern seaboard, we looked for weeks at a time and we found
11 and bought Zenith Springs Farm because of it has an amazing
12 spring on the farm.

13 It is on the -- we are on the base of Peter's
14 Mountain and we have a limestone fissure from whence the
15 spring explodes. It generates somewhere in the neighborhood
16 of 300 gallons a minute of clear, amazing water. The spring
17 has been tested and it has lots of historic recordings of
18 these testings over the years.

19 We are currently involved in the study with Dr.
20 Dorothy Vesper from the WVU. In addition to having a spring
21 on our property, Dropping Lick Creek goes through our
22 property and about a quarter of a mile away is the
23 headwaters of Dropping Lick Creek and it surfaces out of a
24 cave a quarter mile upstream from us.

25 Dorothy Vesper is tracking both of those water

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 sources. The temperature, the pH, TDS -- total dissolved
2 solids, conductivity and alkalinity -- and when Dr. Vesper
3 tests those two springs they are from distinctly different
4 sources, vastly different sources according to their numbers
5 and their recordings a quarter of a mile away and still
6 connected by the creek bed.

7 To me that tells me that there is stuff going on
8 -- the water is moving underground that we don't know about
9 and we don't have a good understanding from whence it came
10 and it is inconceivable that without understanding where
11 those water sources are and how that water is moving that we
12 would proceed ahead to build through that process.

PS3B1-37

13 I think it is time that we update the current
14 geologic study for the area. It is my understanding that
15 the study that you are working from was based in 1929 and
16 the information is way too old for us to base our futures
17 on. Please take a look at the sources of water. Thank you.

PS3B1-37

Geology is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. The surface waters that would be impacted are taken from recent studies or published topographic maps. It is unclear which 1929 source the commentor is referring to.

18 MR. MARTIN: Douglas Martin. I'm Doug Martin,
19 I'm 75 years old. Worked at Virginia Tech -- I'm in my 48th
20 year there. I have an undergraduate, Masters Doctorate. I
21 grew up in the little town of Newport. I still coach little
22 kids third generation baseball. I go to the Methodist
23 Church that was built in 1850 in the Ruritan Club that's 65
24 years old. Our covered bridge is 100 years old.

PS3B1-38

25 A lot of local culture there -- we work, in fact

PS3B1-38

The Greater Newport Rural Historic District is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church is about 430 feet away from the pipeline. The Link Red Covered Bridge is about 365 feet away from the pipeline; the Reynolds Covered Bridge 2,415 feet. The pipeline would be 945 feet away from the 1933 Newport High School. The pipeline would be 3,353 feet way from the Newport Volunteer Fire Department. No homes would be taken in Newport for installation of the MVP; and no people removed. See also the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

20

PS3B1-38
cont'd

1 Colin Powell, I have a picture of him with my son for their
2 civic work that they did. And the pipeline is coming
3 through -- Newport in Giles County is an official village
4 designated by the General Assembly built along the Old
5 Cumberland Gap Turnpike Road, 1994 placed on the National
6 Registry as a historical place.

7 In 2000 Greater Newport Area with 737
8 contributing structures placed on the Greater Newport
9 Historical District and National Registry. I mentioned
10 earlier the Methodist Church started in 1850 and early
11 inquiries to FERC said no you are not close enough.

12 Well now that they have tweaked the road this
13 person they take their house (showing pictures) -- his dad
14 was a World War II POW, he was a military person. This was
15 the church -- this is the center of the road, this is the
16 church and this is one of the old houses in the historical
17 district.

18 The pipeline comes directly through the old high
19 school -- it's not there now, but where it was and let me
20 see what else I can tell you. The -- like I said the
21 proposed pipeline now takes two homes -- there's just to the
22 east of this is the high school I graduated from, it was a
23 nice place it's now the rec center and a private school for
24 little kids.

25 It was coming right by that -- right just to the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

21

1 right of that is the Newport Rescue Squad -- it is coming
2 right by the Rescue Squad. Now it has been tweaked a little
3 bit, I call it pipeline gerrymandering. So they tweaked it
4 and like I said I'm a Virginia Tech employee if I could
5 remember but somewhere in the old literature it says be
6 careful when you come through Newport because you have
7 affluent Virginia Tech faculty.

8 So when does affluency and -- they have built the
9 line around those people -- the guy that I showed you there
10 -- they worked all their live, he is on disability his wife
11 is 75-76 still working. And one of the surveyors told them,
12 "We are going to take your home." You know this is where --
13 and they made it appear the reason we are is because they
14 protested here.

15 So closing the bicentennial people came through
16 and thoroughly enjoyed it in 1996 this is Loretta Lynn's
17 husband if you are in to country music, real nice people.
18 Now we have got Mountain Valley coming and that just doesn't
19 make any sense. Why would you come through a village that
20 is personified Americana.

21 A lady that has since passed away was chief of
22 nursing at the invasion of Normandy, 600 surgeries a day.
23 Another guy there was one of 10 the first off the copter
24 when they sent them into North Vietnam to rescue the troops
25 and it is like thanks for your service, but we are going to

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

22

1 build a 42 inch pipeline that includes in there we can build
2 another 42 inch pipeline.

3 We are talking about a 500 foot swath through our
4 county. Now would you answer me in three minutes? Okay.

5 MR. WOMACK: My name is Scott Womack,

PS3B1-39

6 W-o-m-a-c-k. I haven't been able to read the entire Draft
7 EIS but I read probably half of it and I guess my chief
8 concern with the Draft EIS is that it lays out the potential
9 impact of the pipeline.

10 It mentions that the company will take steps to
11 mitigate those but I couldn't find anywhere where it
12 discusses details of what the mitigation would be. And like
13 any curative action the cure can be as bad or worse than the
14 disease. Not that it is a disease but then the process.

15 So I would like to see some -- at least brief
16 mention of kind of what sort of mitigation and actions we
17 are talking about, especially because in the opening line or
18 the opening executive summary it basically said at the end
19 that anything that was identified in the EIS could be
20 reasonably addressed by the company using mitigation, so
21 that's really all I have to say about it, alright thank you.
22 You all have a good evening.

23 MR. CHASNOFF: My name is Joseph Chasnoff,

24 C-h-a-s-n-o-f-f. Okay this is directed to FERC and to the
25 Forest Service. On August 1, 2016 the Council on

PS3B1-39

Each subsection within section 4 of the EIS provides mitigation measures. The plans are listed in section 2.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

23

1 Environmental Quality Executive Office of the President
2 issued its final guidance for federal departments and
3 agencies on consideration of greenhouse gas emissions and
4 the effects of climate change and National Environmental
5 Policy Act reviews.

6 "Climate change is a fundamental environmental
7 issue and its effects fall squarely within the purview."
8 This document continues, "And recommends that the agencies
9 quantify proposed agency's action projected and direct and
10 indirect greenhouse gas emissions."

11 This final guidance for federal
12 agencies applies to both FERC and the Forest Service and
13 discusses methods to appropriately analyze or reasonable
14 foreseeable direct and indirect and cumulative greenhouse
15 gas emissions and climate effects and guides the
16 consideration of short and long-term effects and benefits in
17 the alternatives and mitigation analysis contained in the
18 Draft or Final EIS prepared by a federal agency pursuant to
19 its NEPA responsibilities.

20 The document goes on to state that NEPA is
21 "designed to promote consideration and potential effects on
22 the human environment that would result from proposed
23 federal agency actions before decisions are made. NEPA
24 review should identify measures to avoid minimize and
25 mitigate adverse effects of federal agency actions."

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 This document also reviews the urgency of
2 addressing the causes of climate change and says, "Broadly
3 stated the effects of climate change observed to date that
4 are projected to occur in the future include frequent and
5 enhanced heatwaves, larger fire seasons and more severe wild
6 fires, degraded air quality, more heavy downpours, flooding,
7 increased draught, greater sea level rise and intense
8 storms, harmed water resources, harm to agriculture, ocean
9 acidification and harm to wildlife and eco-systems."

10 Further I quote, "A statement that a proposed
11 action represents only a small fraction of global emissions
12 is not an appropriate basis for deciding whether or to what
13 extent to consider climate change impacts under NEPA."

14 Turning your attention to the Draft EIS issued by
15 FERC for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project we have only
16 to consider that Mountain Valley Pipeline is a "fracked gas
17 pipeline" of the largest size namely 42 inches in diameter.
18 In order to realize that if the executive orders on climate
19 change and the Council of Environmental Quality guidance on
20 greenhouse gas emissions apply to any federal agency or
21 agency action -- it most certainly applies to this
22 particular NEPA review.

PS3B1-40

23 Methane -- the main component of fracked gas is
24 the most potent of all of the greenhouse gases. Sadly and
25 shockingly the Draft EIS was written and published without

PS3B1-40

Climate change is discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding hydraulic fracturing. 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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

25

PS3B1-40
cont'd

1 any of the quantitative analysis required with respect to
2 greenhouse gas emissions. The parts left out include the
3 effects of the fracked gas pipeline in promoting fracking
4 and the fracking fields and the release of methane in all of
5 the fracked wells which has been quantified to be somewhere
6 in the range from 2 and to 7% of the methane which is
7 released into the atmosphere.

8 How much -- so the quantitative analysis must
9 include the sources of the greenhouse gas emissions -- all
10 of them, direct and indirect and it must have to answer the
11 following questions. How much unburned methane will escape
12 into the atmosphere and from the fracked wells that will be
13 drilled over the lifetime of this project?

14 Over the expected lifetime how much unburned
15 methane will leak from the pipeline itself, the compressor
16 stations and the transfer facilities? How much CO2 will be
17 added to the atmosphere as a result of burning the fossil
18 fuel transported in the pipeline?

19 What is the greenhouse gas emission cost to the
20 environment of fueling all the earth-moving equipment and
21 transporting material including the pipe needed to instruct
22 the fossil fuel infrastructure? Are there clean
23 alternatives of energy that could meet our energy needs with
24 less impact upon the environment? The answer to that one is
25 yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 My life runs on solar energy. And
2 that's a change that we all need to make in the society
3 quickly and with the kind of determination when this country
4 went to World War II we harnessed the nation to deal with an
5 impending crisis. This crisis of climate change is
6 unfortunately much bigger and more impactful than even a war
7 which this nation fought in the 1940's.

PS3B1-41

8 The subject of climate change and effect upon the
9 planet is daunting and humbling. I am certainly unprepared
10 and unable and unqualified to answer complicated crucial
11 questions that I and many others are asking. This task
12 however is squarely in front of our federal agencies
13 including the FERC and the Forest Service when they consider
14 the future of our nation's energy infrastructure.

15 And this pipeline is just exactly that type of
16 decision. There is no project that could be brought in
17 front of the FERC that would be more pertinent to
18 determining the energy, infrastructure future of this nation
19 and it needs -- that infrastructure needs to be 100% clean
20 energy as soon as possible to mitigate devastating effects
21 which already are happening and will continue to happen
22 because of climate change.

23 As I understand it there does not exist a more
24 serious or impactful subject confronting our government or
25 the human race. The Mountain Valley Pipeline Draft EIS

PS3B1-41

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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

27

1 doesn't even come close to beginning to address this subject
2 and the whole DEIS should be reconsidered for that reason.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. OLSON: My name is Dana Olson, D-a-n-a
5 O-l-s-o-n. As a resident of Monroe County, West Virginia,
6 living at the foot of Peter's Mountain I am appalled at all

PS3B1-42

7 the information totally ignored and dismissed by FERC. In
8 the DEIS for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project for the
9 past two years I and many other citizens in the area have
10 furnished information about springs, wetlands, karst areas,
11 steep slope, endangered species, depths to bedrock, special
12 places of cultural historical significance and countless
13 other issues.

14 Most of these have never been addressed and
15 simply glossed over with a statement such as "This will be
16 mitigated." You cannot mitigate this majestic one of a kind
17 mountain, Peter's Mountain. You cannot fix water once you
18 taint it.

19 One example of this total disregard for
20 information is found on page 4-73 Table 4.3 1-2 of the DEIS.
21 This table lists zero springs or falls in Monroe County.
22 When dozens upon dozens of springs and falls are in or near
23 the MVP corridor have been reported is such an example.

24 I know this has been done as I have been actively
25 involved with "Save Monroe" and "Discover Monroe" in

PS3B1-42

The EIS addresses springs in section 4.3, wetlands in sections 4.3, karst in section 4.1, steep slopes in section 4.1, endangered species in section 4.7, bedrock in section 4.1, and cultural resources in section 4.10. See the response to comment IND401-5 regarding pending water wells.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 28

PS3B1-43 1 providing this information. Mountain Valley Pipeline has
2 not provided critical information required in response to
3 many questions raised by FERC staff, U.S. Forest Service and
4 other agencies. FERC has failed to follow NEPA regulations
5 15-02.9A where it states Draft Environmental Impact
6 Statements be prepared in accordance with the scope decided
7 upon in the scoping process and the Draft Statement shall
8 fulfill and satisfy to the fullest extent the possible
9 requirements for Final Statements in Section 102C of the
10 Act.

PS3B1-44 11 If the Draft Statement is too inadequate to
12 preclude meaningful analysis the Agency shall prepare and
13 circulate a revised Draft of the appropriate portion. The
14 Agency shall make every effort to disclose and discuss at
15 appropriate points in the Draft Statement all danger points
16 of view, all the environmental impacts, all the alternatives
17 including the proposed action.

PS3B1-45 18 For this reason and more I ask FERC to take no
19 action and reject the MVP Project. Furthermore I oppose any
20 corridor across Peter's Mountain, the Jefferson National
21 Forest as unnecessary and refute this proposal as a form of
22 state-sponsored terrorism perpetrated by FERC upon the
23 people of the area and the users of the Jefferson National
24 Forest, the Appalachian Trail and the citizens of West
25 Virginia and Virginia, thank you.

PS3B1-43 Mountain Valley has filed supplemental information in response to our EIRs, and we have included these data in the final EIS.

PS3B1-44 See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS.

PS3B1-45 Impacts on the Jefferson National Forest and ANST are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-46

1 MS. KNAPP: Carley C-a-r-l-e-y Knapp K-n-a-p-p.
2 I wanted to come in to ask please that the Mountain Valley
3 Pipeline not be allowed access through the Allegheny
4 Mountain Range. The ecological cost is far too high. This
5 is the third most bio-diverse region in the country. This
6 mountain range formed when all the continents were still
7 one, a billion years ago.

PS3B1-47

8 And this one action -- this one pipeline could
9 cause a ripple effect of destruction and degradation to the
10 whole eco-system. Ultimately citizens of West Virginia will
11 pay this huge cost with their health. The entire area will
12 suffer whether the pipeline crosses through their property
13 or not.

14 The pipeline plan I find immoral. It is
15 senseless and it is unjust. People who live here have a
16 spiritual connection to the land also. God is present in
17 the environmental life in this region in the forest, in the
18 animal and plant life God has revealed to us. For
19 generations the families of Native Americans, African
20 Americans and European Americans have been rooted here in
21 the beauty of God's holy creation connected to the living
22 spirit of the land.

23 Great confusion, chaos and harm is done to us
24 when we lose this connection to the land because of
25 destructive, catastrophic practices that wreak havoc rather

PS3B1-46

The MVP pipeline route does not cross the Allegheny Mountain Range. The EIS concluded that for most resources there would not be significant adverse effects.

PS3B1-47

The potential health effects regarding methane are discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 30

1 than protect, that break down rather than build up the
2 people of this region.

3 This area is our ecological sanctuary. Please do
4 not send machinery to blow large sections of it up, thank
5 you.

6 MR. PILKINGTON: Jonathan Pilkington,
7 P-i-l-k-i-n-g-t-o-n. I'm concerned with several issues
8 stated in the Draft Environmental Impact Study. One in
9 particular is the crossing of the Greenbrier River. They
10 said they are going to do an open trench and that they were
11 doing a scour analysis which has not been completed and we
12 will not be able to comment on it after it has been
13 completed until it goes into the EIS.

14 I think that scour analysis should have been done
15 prior to even issuing the Draft Environmental Impact Study.

16 I am also concerned with their mitigation throughout the
17 study. It says they are going to mitigate the compressor
18 station's emissions by buying carbon taxes or something. I
19 don't think that's mitigation at all.

20 I am also concerned with climate change -- how
21 they address climate change. I don't think that was fully
22 thought out and really all they are saying is they are
23 responsible for climate change is the carbon from their five
24 compressor stations. They are pumping billions of cubic
25 feet of gas that contains carbon out of the ground and they

PS3B1-48

PS3B1-49

PS3B1-50

PS3B1-48

Mountain Valley now proposes to cross the Greenbrier River using dry techniques including a coffer dam. Section 4.3 of the EIS has been revised to include updated scour analysis information provided by MVP in October 2016 and analyzed by FERC staff.

PS3B1-49

As stated in section 4.11.1.3 of the EIS, except for Mountain Valley's Bradshaw Compressor Station (which is subject to Title V permitting), emissions from the new compressor stations would be minor sources of air pollution. Using low NOx turbine combustors, low emission levels would be achieved with normal engine maintenance and operation using pipeline quality natural gas. Implementation of BAT for Equitrans' Redhook Compressor Station as required by the PADEP air quality permitting regulations would minimize emissions of criteria air pollutant. In addition, modeled air quality screening analysis performed for each of the new compressor stations (the MVP's Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth and the EEP's Redhook) show that emissions due to the compressor stations' operations would not exceed the NAAQS. Therefore, any emissions resulting from operation of the compressor facilities would not be expected to have significant impacts on local or regional air quality.

PS3B1-50

Climate change is addressed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 31

1 can accessible, easily accessible, readily accessible and
2 cheap for all of these power plants to convert from coal if
3 they just pump carbon.

4 People think that gas is cleaner than coal. It
5 is -- I worked in a coal-fired power plant and worked in a
6 gas-fired power plant. It is cleaner but it still emits
7 carbon, they both emit carbon. So I am concerned about
8 that. And I have one other concern -- I can't think of the
9 other one. Thank you.

PS3B1-51 10 I'm also concerned about the safety factor of a
11 42 inch pipeline going through this rugged terrain. I think
12 a 42 inch pipeline has never even been tried on this rugged
13 terrain. The 20 inch pipeline blew up last year in
14 Barboursville and a 30 inch pipeline blew up and melted the
15 interstate up in Sissonville.

PS3B1-52 16 This is a heavier pipeline -- it is not I mean, a
17 lot of engineers -- civil engineers will tell you it is
18 impossible to put a 42 inch pipeline straight down a
19 mountain at an 8% grade and it not fail. I mean it might
20 not fail immediately but within the first year it will fail
21 and that's not even saying unforeseen issues like
22 instability or cracks or anything -- just straight up
23 technically the steel is not strong enough to go have a mile
24 straight down a mountain.

25 And I talked to a FERC guy that helped write the

PS3B1-51 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipelines in karst terrain.

PS3B1-52 Engineers reviewed the Applicants' pipeline designs.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 32

1 DEIS stating that and he said they have a section on safety
2 but safety is not theirs it is the Department of
3 Transportation. I think FERC should be extremely concerned
4 about the safety of this pipeline because they are blowing
5 up everywhere.

6 I mean you can't go a month, a week, barely
7 without a pipeline somewhere in this country exploding and
8 killing people and damaging property and setting forest
9 fires. Just yesterday, the day before Sunday the gasoline
10 pipeline blew up in Alabama, the second time in a month and
11 a half. I'm concerned about that. I think FERC should be
12 too, thank you.

13 MR. MARTIN: Perry Martin. My name is Perry
14 Martin. I'm a lifelong resident of Newport, Virginia. I am
15 opposed to the current Mountain Valley Pipeline route. My
16 concerns that I would like to express cross a number of
17 issues. One in particular I believe the current DEIS is
18 very inaccurate in terms of a number of issues on its impact
19 with the community of Newport, particularly most
20 specifically I would say that since the DEIS was released
21 that path has changed.

22 I serve as Trustee of Newport -- head of Trustees
23 for Newport Mt. Olive United Methodist Church. The route
24 has shifted to where it is immediately adjacent to our
25 property. This would put us in a blast zone. It puts us

PS3B1-53

PS3B1-53

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3B1-54

PS3B1-54

See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. The Newport Historic District and Greater Newport Rural Historic District are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3B1-55

PS3B1-55

The pipeline would be about 430 feet away from the Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-56

1 also in a line of site where it is right there right at our
2 church. Additionally we have a community village green
3 that's right there. This has also moved closer to where
4 there are a number of community events that are held very
5 regular.

6 I did bring this today -- this is a fairly
7 accurate rendering of the community as it looks from Route
8 42. We haven't had that much snow in a while I'll say that
9 -- but this gives you an idea of the view of the community
10 and then where that pipe roughly would come through there.

PS3B1-57

11 My concern is from a visual impact this is a very
12 significant community that again an artist has saw fit to
13 capture that scene there and it is a very popular
14 photograph. I am also concerned twice in recent years we
15 have had -- the Board of Supervisors have community meetings
16 about revitalization in this area.

17 We have talked about streetscaping, the planting
18 of trees, repairing of sidewalks -- this would go right in
19 the middle of where that has been discussed in previous

PS3B1-58

20 years. So my concern is about the historic community -- the
21 impact on it. But this is a vibrant community where there
22 is active programs and also people looking to the future.

23 As we speak tonight there is a community meeting
24 that looks at the future of our recreation center which
25 again is influenced by this pipe. This is a monthly meeting

PS3B1-56

There are more than 300,000 miles of natural gas pipelines currently in the United States; many are close to churches, schools, hospitals, etc.

PS3B1-57

Visual impacts are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PS3B1-58

The MVP pipeline would be about 945 feet away from the Newport Recreation Center. Only intervenors would have standing to challenge a Commission decision.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

34

1 where if I were not here I would be there talking about the
2 future directions of this community center and the program
3 that we want to do there.

4 So this impacts kids --this impacts all ages. I
5 don't think these things are very adequately represented in
6 the DEIS statement. I do not think that they are a very
7 easy pick-up on a mapping scenario and I think it is very
8 important that they are heard. I am a life-long resident of
9 the community. I am pursuing a Doctorate at Virginia Tech
10 right now in agricultural and community leadership and so a
11 lot of my path has been informed by real life experiences of
12 community leadership in this community.

13 And so I would say any pipe that comes to the
14 Newport Community is going to be met with a very, very
15 fierce resistance. Is that the time? Okay and so again as
16 we are looking at litigation and those pipes, this is going
17 to be a very drawn out process and our heels are dug in in
18 Newport, thank you.

19 MR. BROUSSARD: Okay my name is James Travers
20 Broussard, T-r-a-v-e-r-s and the last name is Broussard,
21 B-r-o-u-s-s-a-r-d. So what I am here to talk about is I
22 moved to this location for the beauty and splendor of it and
23 I left a city suburb that was getting pretty shitty and I
24 don't want somebody bringing the shitty into my beautiful
25 splendor. That's it -- that's my whole bottom line.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-59

1 I don't want their shitty in my splendor. That's
2 it. If we could polish this up with a bazillion words in a
3 book that thick is just not what I have to say. Thank you.

4 MS. BROUSSARD: Diane Broussard,
5 B-r-o-u-s-s-a-r-d the same last name. Speaking of health
6 problems I moved here for the healing properties of the
7 mountain and the area. We moved here about 4 years ago and
8 we left our home in Maryland -- 6 or 7 hour trip because I
9 could no longer breathe there in that environment.

10 I searched for 5 years -- my husband and I
11 searched for 5 years to find a place where I could breathe
12 -- where the environment would permit me to breathe so I
13 wouldn't have to go on different kinds of medications and
14 deal with the side effects. I can breathe here without any
15 medications. The air here is pure.

16 The environment here is healing and excuse me let
17 me look at my notes -- when we were looking for property we
18 saw photos that included a view of the mountains from our
19 property. We fell in love with the view and that's why we
20 made the long trip to check out the property.

21 And once we were there we bought our property for
22 the view. In fact we have met many people here that have
23 transplanted here from all over the country, from Florida,
24 from New England states, from Arizona, from Texas, all over
25 for the healing of this mountain for this climate and they

PS3B1-59

Visual impacts are discussed in section 4.8 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 remained here for that reason. Three people on our road
2 have already moved out -- the pipeline is threatening and
3 reading through this feel even more threatened.

4 I don't know if either of you have read all the
5 way through this or not. I am much more frightened after
6 reading this than before I read it. I think this is
7 supposed to be like you know a little comfort system like we
8 are going to do this, we are going to do that but in reading
9 through this what I find is they don't have an understanding
10 or they do when they are not letting on of how fragile the
11 karst is and how easily it can disrupt our water flow.

PS3B1-60

PS3B1-60

Karst is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

12 But back to the health problem -- I suffer from
13 lime disease also and that causes my hearing to be very
14 hypersensitive to the point any loud noises or any medium
15 loud noises that continuous will be painful and they will
16 make me totally unproductive -- I just shut down its like --
17 kind of like a child with autism -- when you have too much
18 input.

PS3B1-61

PS3B1-61

See the response to comment PS3B1-49 regarding air emissions. See the response to comment IND439-3 regarding noise impacts. Mountain Valley would not force landowners to move from their house.

19 In reading through this this project will
20 definitely hurt me to the point where we will be forced to
21 move. I don't know if MVP or FERC will help people find
22 another home. I just don't know -- I didn't see anything
23 about that in this booklet but to survive I would have to
24 move and go through the whole process again of trying to
25 find a place with clean air. There is not many of them left

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 37

1 out there, there aren't.

2 And maybe neither one of you -- people with FERC

3 have to deal with breathing problems but it is your life.

4 If you can't breathe you are gone. If you have a child with

5 asthma you know where I am coming from -- you want to find a

6 place where you can breathe. This place, this county is a

7 paradise. It is very healing. There are many people that

8 have benefitted.

9 And we have to sacrifice. There aren't jobs

10 close by. My husband hasn't been able to find work so we

11 are living off of a meager savings that we have until social

12 security sets in. So we don't want to move. We don't want

13 to lose everything. I mean he started a small farm, we have

14 honeybees, organic crops and our honeybee keeping is

15 organic.

16 You know we are doing everything exactly how you

17 are supposed to do it to maintain the environment and then

18 within months this pipeline wants to come through and just

19 take away everything we moved for and everything we worked

20 for and everything we love here and nobody is listening.

21 They say they want public comments but nobody is

22 doing anything. Look elsewhere because this mountain is not

23 the right place for this pipeline. It shouldn't be here.

24 When I first wrote to Kim Bowes back in mid-November -- I

25 mean mid 2015 I told her there has been an error in planning

PS3B1-62

PS3B1-62

Organic farms are addressed in section 4.8 of the EIS. See the response to comment IND76-1 regarding bees.

PS3B1-63

PS3B1-63

Route selection is discussed in section 3 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS. See the response to comment LA1-4 regarding existing 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipelines in karst terrain. See the response to comment LA5-1 regarding stakeholder comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

38

PS3B1-63
cont'd

1 that the karst is not the place to put this pipeline.
2 And reading through the book there's just total
3 lack of knowledge and ignorance about the karst. Its
4 fragility and it is God-given mission here in Monroe County
5 as a conduit for resident's drinking water. You know what a
6 conduit is. The water goes all through this karst. If you
7 damage the water, or if you contaminate it that flows
8 through the whole area -- through all the caves and it is
9 going to hurt all these different people.

10 I don't like MVP or FERC looking at us as
11 expendable and that's exactly what's happening here. Also
12 looking through this -- do either of you have children? No
13 -- okay well maybe -- looking through this it is the longest
14 comic strip that I have ever read. And I say that because
15 when I was reading through it there was a picture forming in
16 my mind -- an analogy if you want to call it that, of a
17 child that wants a puppy.

18 And that child will do anything, say anything
19 that he has to -- he or she has to in order to get that
20 puppy. And that's what this MVP is -- it's like a child
21 asking for a puppy -- a pipeline and it is going to say

PS3B1-64

22 whatever -- whatever you want to hear so they can say yes we
23 are safe this pipeline is safe and it is not.

24 And everybody knows that. There was a pipeline
25 explosion just days ago. Things don't go as planned or as

PS3B1-64

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

1 they say they are going to mitigate it and this is just one
2 big comic strip. And as a FERC representative I think it
3 will be a crime to permit MVP to conduct any sort of
4 construction or any company for that matter of this
5 magnitude through this karst conduit.

PS3B1-65

6 It will kill the residents in one way or another,
7 either by slow contamination or deprivation of our water
8 supply, a tragic death by gas explosion or the worst yet is
9 death of their spirit because this mountain -- Peter's
10 Mountain holds a lot of spirit. And once you are here for a
11 while -- I don't know how long you have been here, how long
12 you are staying if it is just a drive through -- once you
13 are here for a while the mountain works on you.

PS3B1-65

See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.
See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

14 And that will be destroyed with this project --
15 there's no way to avoid it.

PS3B1-66

16 MS. CHLEPAS: My name is Patti P-a-t-t-i
17 C-h-l-e-p-a-s. I'm here to speak primarily about the
18 narrows of Hans Creek which runs right through the pipeline
19 route. It is one of the most spectacularly beautiful
20 pristine mountain settings and in and of itself it is a
21 narrows so that means it is like a tiny canyon. The
22 pipeline route bisects it -- it just blasts it.

PS3B1-66

The pipeline would be installed below the narrows of Hans Creek
not through it.

23 The idea that that would be obliterated is just
24 blasphemous to me because it just doesn't seem possible. I
25 mean there are bear up there, there are all kinds of

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-67 | 1 wildlife. We have a farm that we named Birds on Farm. We
2 have an aviary -- my husband spoke earlier about our aviary.
3 We have honeybees and of course we would lose our aviary due
4 to the defoliation that they are planning as a result.

PS3B1-68 | 5 So -- and I'm a geologist too so I'm well aware
6 of the fact that we would lose our well. We are on a well.
7 But just the protection of that narrows of Hans Creek should
8 be considered -- really the protection of the entire area
9 should be considered but that little area is such a jewel.
10 And there are also sites that are spiritual sites back in
11 there because there is a church right next to us and they do
12 baptisms in the creek. It's just spectacular.

13 And I can't imagine that this would go through --
14 that that could possibly go just seems incomprehensible. I
15 just wanted to say that thank you.

16 MS. NEEL: Arna A-r-n-a Neel N-e-e-l. Well my
17 address is on the Peter's Mountain. Okay I'm Arna Neel I
18 live at Zenith, West Virginia and is right at the foot of
19 Peter's Mountain and it is 3,800 and some feet behind my
20 house so when it snows it is beautiful. And also when the
21 wind blows it can be very cold.

22 We have the same water -- spring water at my
23 house as they do 6 and miles out to Gap Mills where they
24 have the Sweet Springs bottled water plant, it is the same
25 thing. And I am blessed because that has won world

PS3B1-67 See the response to comment LA1-7 regarding herbicides. See the response to comment IND76-1 regarding bees.

PS3B1-68 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 41

1 recognition as being the best water the first year that they
2 opened, that Sweet Springs bottled water has.

3 Now my son lives a mile and a half from me but
4 his spring is probably a thousand feet lower on the
5 mountain, same mountain and he does not have that same
6 stream of water. So there are various streams of water so
7 if any one of them were to crumble it would take them all --
8 it would just be like a domino effect underground.

9 Now that's what I am really worried about. I
10 don't know exactly how to stress how worried I am because
11 that I am very, very worried about. I'm afraid that it will
12 crumble with this pipeline. And I think even down here as
13 far as Peterstown it could run 18 miles on that mountain and
14 crumble everything. I mean it could just be like say domino
15 -- just going, going, going.

16 And also I have great cultural attachments to
17 where I live because I have lived there for 50 years and it
18 is an old farmhouse and everybody says, "Oh you need to move
19 some place where you have a new house and things." When I
20 go back in there it is the 1800's I don't have to hear
21 anything -- I don't have to have all the modern noises the
22 TV and internet and everything. If I want it I can have it
23 -- if I don't, I don't have to have it.

24 But I just like to sit down and watch the
25 mountain. And I don't have much time. I work down here at

PS3B1-69

PS3B1-69

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

PS3B1-70

PS3B1-70

Cultural attachment is addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

42

1 the school with the little first graders. Excuse me -- and
2 I sit down and every minute the mountain changes, this is
3 cultural attachment. You look at that mountain and every
4 minute a cloud will come over the sun and change it -- an
5 eagle will fly over, a big bird maybe a buzzard but we have
6 the golden and the bald headed eagles now and they won't
7 stay around where noise is. I mean they have to have it
8 quiet and they are right behind my house, they come down in
9 our fields and stuff.

10 I'm kind of a little bit afraid they might steal
11 one of our dogs but if you want one thing you have to put up
12 with the other. No -- just watch that mountain change --
13 it's just very healthy for you it makes you feel better.
14 You can be just bone tired and you can watch that mountain
15 for five minutes and you are ready to get up and go again.

16 But we are very attached to the mountain the way
17 it is with the eagles and we have bear and deer and all that
18 good stuff -- but the water is the main thing. We are so
19 worried about something happening to that water shed. We
20 are just almost to the point of being panicked on the water.
21 It's very hard to tell you all the good things about where
22 we live.

23 I guess that's all I have to say. I just wanted
24 to make sure that I got a comment in about the water and
25 just the cultural attachment to the land.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

Comment ID	Text
20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016	43
PS3B1-71	<p>1 MS. MARENECK: Carli C-a-r-l-i Mareneck 2 M-a-r-e-n-e-c-k. My first statement is that one does not 3 need to be a professional to recognize how flawed the Draft 4 Environmental Impact Statement conclusions are. The water 5 and geological hazards have been identified for our karst 6 regions by professionals such as Ernst Casting and Pamela 7 Dodds and what is missing in this large document that the 8 public needs to note.</p>
PS3B1-72	<p>9 I'll begin by my understanding of what FERC is 10 charged with. FERC is charged with the responsibility of 11 scrutinizing proposals from industrial interests to judge if 12 they will harm the communities they impact. As this lengthy 13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates this review 14 is far from complete and is skewed to understate the impacts 15 on many aspects of our region including our water sheds -- 16 that will be irrevocable if the Mountain Valley Pipeline is 17 allowed to be constructed.</p>
PS3B1-73	<p>18 A few quotes from the DEIS -- on page 113 the 19 DEIS states, "The mission of the Forest Service is to 20 sustain the health and diversity of our national forests and 21 grasslands to meet the needs of present and future 22 generations." Surely the four proposed amendments would 23 directly prevent the Forest Service from meeting that 24 mission -- a 500 foot corridor that would require allocation 25 of over 372 acres including 111 acres of old growth forest</p>

PS3B1-71 See the response to comments FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment IND62-1 regarding Dr. Kastning's report.

PS3B1-72 Water resources are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3B1-73 Use of NFS lands for public needs for infrastructure are part of the mission for the Forest Service. The FS, COE, BLM, FWS, EPA, and DOT are cooperating in a manner consistent with the May 2002 interagency agreement with the FERC.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016		44
PS3B1-73 cont'd	1 allowing the Mountain Valley Pipeline to not meet standing 2 restrictions on soil conditions or riparian corridors. 3 The removal of old growth forest, the crossing of 4 the Appalachian Trail -- all of this would preclude the 5 Forest Service from meeting their mission. On page 446 the	
PS3B1-74	6 DEIS states, "The construction and operation of Mountain 7 Valley's proposed pipeline could result in unstable slopes 8 including cut slope failures and fill slope failures. The 9 potential for landslides or slope failures could be 10 triggered by seismicity or from intense and/or prolonged 11 rainfall." 12 Enough -- none of the mitigations listed in the 13 plans would be adequate to prevent irrevocable damage to our 14 area. The DEIS claims on page 447 -- upon completion of the	
PS3B1-75	15 construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, upon 16 completion of construction the Mountain Valley Pipeline 17 would restore the disturbed areas to the original contours 18 "to the extent possible". 19 Again, go up and down over Peter's Mountain a 500 20 foot corridor through bedrock and our water sheds, you will 21 not be able to restore anything. Our water is precious. I 22 have lived in Monroe County for 40 years, read the DEIS	
PS3B1-76	23 statement on page 475 says, "Information regarding privately 24 owned wells and springs in West Virginia and Virginia is not 25 publicly available."	

PS3B1-74 Steep slope mitigation measures are provide in section 4.1.2.4 of the EIS.

PS3B1-75 See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3B1-76 Pre-construction testing is necessary to determine a baseline in order to document any changes post construction. See the response to comment CO2-1 regarding benefits. See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

PS3B1-76
cont'd

1 Many homes in our region including my own depend
2 on a spring or a well for our water. I, as a citizen and as
3 a resident here am not interested in pre and post
4 construction water quality testing. After the construction
5 it is too late.

6 In conclusion this DEIS is woefully inaccurate
7 and inadequate. The Mountain Valley Pipeline threatens
8 residents' health and safety and offers us no benefits. The
9 dangers are high during construction and will only increase
10 as the pipeline would age. There are no grounds for
11 considering the Mountain Valley project as an eminent domain
12 project, thank you.

13 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:00
14 p.m.)

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 1 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

46

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: Peterstown, West 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 Gaynell Catherine

25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B - 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
11 Peterstown Elementary School
12 108 College Drive
13 Peterstown, West Virginia 24963
14 Thursday, November 3, 2016

15
16 A public verbal comment session on the Draft EIS was
17 held, pursuant to notice. starting at 5 p.m.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 49

1 VERBAL COMMENT SESSION

2 FERC: Three minutes. And then if you're able

3 to read through the entire, your full comments within three

4 minutes, that's great. If not, either way I can take your

5 printed comments and we'll incorporate that into the record

6 as well. If you could identify your full name first and

7 last and spell them. Organization and if you're a

8 landowner, your address.

9 MR. DEPLAZES: Gary Deplazes. D E P L A Z E S.

10 And address is 291 Seven Oaks Road, Newport, Virginia,

11 24128.

12 FERC: And when you're ready sir, you can start

13 with your comment.

14 MR. DEPLAZES: Our family has four properties

15 in the path of this pipeline, and one half mile of pipeline.

16 An access route through our yard and barnyard. Over springs

17 and watering systems. Through the dividing pasture to the

18 pipeline. Another one half mile of pipeline through our

19 business property. Including a permanent road, a stationary

20 and 75 x 75 valve location. Our son is a part owner of two

21 business properties, one of which is -- the agent says will

22 have to be sold in its entirety to MVP; the other property

23 is in the Newport Historic District.

PS3B2-1 24 The pipeline will affect the family home, and

25 business significantly. However, our deepest concern is,

PS3B2-1 Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. The Greater Newport Rural Historic District is addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The Deplazes house is about 907 feet away from the pipeline. The Newport Mount Olivet Methodist Church is about 435 feet away; Newport Recreation Center 945 feet.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-1
cont'd

1 for the time you start the Village of Newport with a
2 pipeline, that access road will cause great turmoil and
3 damage
4 to the community. Which centers around a Methodist church,
5 historic homes and the Newport recreation center.
6 Originally, the HCA all of which are listed is the historic
7 registry.

PS3B2-2

8 The issue that the MVP does not address is
9 another route much more preferable, and has been proposed
10 for reason of avoiding Karst, historic properties and
11 buildings, and deep slopes, unstable soils and seismic zones
12 and HCAs. Reports by Dave Brady and Lousia Gay have been
13 filed with FERC, enumerating the reasons for this other
14 route.

15 The Hybrid route avoids 15 miles of historic
16 and potentially eligible historic districts, avoids several
17 significant Newport historic properties, avoids Forest
18 Service, crosses over .6 miles of United States Forest
19 Service as opposed to 3.4 miles of greenfield. Across 100
20 miles of less shallow bedrock, crosses 16 miles across
21 Karst, crosses nine miles less force. It crosses one
22 thousand feet less wetlands. It moves the route to the edge
23 of the Pembroke fault zone.

24 For these reasons, I oppose the MVP Route 200
25 and propose the serious consideration of Alternate Route 1A.

PS3B2-2

Section 3 of this final EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid
1A Alternative.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 51

1 FERC: All right. And if you could provide us
2 with your first and last name. Spell that. And your street
3 address.
4 MRS. DEPLAZES: My name is Jerolyn Deplazes.
5 It's spelled J E R O L Y N. D E P L A Z E S. I'm a
6 landowner. My husband was just in here. Oh, and I didn't
7 sign this one. It's fine. We have two organizations in
8 Newport that are opposing the pipeline.
9 FERC: Whenever you're ready, ma'am.
10 MRS. DEPLAZES: All right. I wrote about
11 concerns about the MVP route 200 through Newport. The MVP
12 route 200 through the tiny community of Newport, Virginia.
13 Newport Historic district and the greater rural Newport
14 Historic district. It will have a disastrous effect on
15 several homes and the community at large, when a more
16 acceptable route has been proposed several times, by a
17 variety of experts.

18 It appears that FERC and MVP have not taken a
19 serious look at one alternative, the Hybrid Alternate 1A.
20 In a small section of Giles County route 200 comes very
21 close to Pig Hole Cave, Tawney's Cave, and Canoe Cave. It
22 passes within a hundred feet of the Link Covered Bridge, of
23 1912. It completely consumes the property originally called
24 the Fidel Smith Store. It overtakes a business property
25 with a staging field, permanent access road and a placement

PS3B2-3

PS3B2-3

The Newport Historic District and the Greater Newport Rural Historic District are addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PS3B2-4

PS3B2-4

Section 3 of this final EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative.

PS3B2-5

PS3B2-5

Section 3 of this final EIS has been revised to discuss the Hybrid 1A Alternative. The currently proposed route would be about 163 feet away from the Fidel Smith Store; and 365 feet from the Link Red Covered Bridge. Pig Hole Cave would be about 1,640 feet from the pipeline; Tawney Cave 131 feet, and Canoe Cave 902 feet. No homes would be taken out in the village of Newport; but the company would seek to negotiate agreements to acquire its easement.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

52

PS3B2-5
cont'd

1 of a valve area. It would take out a swath of timber in the
2 village proper and cross the only regularly used
3 thoroughfare -- Route 42 -- from Route 460 into Craig County
4 which is also designated as bluegrass by the Bluegrass
5 Trail, a scenic byway.

6 It proposes to take out one home, come within
7 500 feet of a historic church, and a 1909 historic home and
8 proceed up a steep hillside. From there it passes over
9 farmlands and another huge cave before it leaves Giles
10 County. That is only one section of concern that route 200
11 takes. The advantages of Hybrid Alternate 1A offers, it
12 doesn't go through any historic districts, compared to Route
13 200 that impacts eight historic districts. It follows an
14 already existent utility corridor. It crosses less forested
15 lands, less wetlands, less shallow bedrock, less steep
16 slopes. It crosses less Karst, 16 miles less.

17 I propose that FERC require MVP to conduct a
18 thorough assessment -- I should say thorough and accurate
19 assessment -- of Route 200 compared to Hybrid Alternate 1A
20 before granting permission for Route 200.

21 All right.

22

23 <> MS. JONES: Donna Jones. D O N N A J O N E S.
24 I'm a landowner. We are landowners. Our address is 641
25 Stevers Gap Trail. Newport, Virginia, 24128.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-6

1 FERC: When you're ready I'll start.
2 MS. JONES: All right. I guess I'm ready. I'm
3 here because I am directly effected by the proposed
4 pipeline. I oppose this route. This route, if approved,
5 will directly and forever effect our place of residence in
6 Craig County, Virginia. This is my homeplace. I'm speaking
7 for my husband. This is my homeplace where I have lived my
8 entire life of 63 years. This is where my father lived, and
9 his father.

10 This pipeline, if approved, will put my family
11 and my neighbors safety in danger, as this area is not
12 capable of servicing a pipeline of this size because of the
13 Karst terrain, wetlands, and sinkholes in this area. This
14 area floods from just a steady hard rain and rutting the
15 road beneath where the pipeline will be built. I know this
16 from living here and walking this land my entire life. I
17 know it like the back of my hand. This is my safe haven
18 where I go to see where God's hand has touched nature.

PS3B2-7

19 Our house sits directly against Gap Mountain
20 and at the end of state maintained road, 642, the pipeline
21 is proposed to be built within 200 yards of our front door
22 crossing our only means of entrance to our home. We will
23 have to cross a pipeline each and every time we enter or
24 exit our residence. We will have to think about this every
25 day of our lives and wonder if this is the day it could

PS3B2-6

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. The EIS addresses karst terrain in section 4.1, wetlands in section 4.3, and sinkholes in section 4.1. A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in section 4.3.2 of the EIS.

PS3B2-7

Mountain Valley would maintain access for landowners.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 54

1 explode.

PS3B2-8 | 2 We have no way of escaping if something major
3 were to happen, as this is our only means of entrance. MVP
4 has not presented an evacuation route, as there is none.
5 Our county is serviced by volunteer emergency fire and
6 rescue that does not have the equipment to assist if the
7 pipeline were to explode. Living in this rural area, the
8 emergency response time would be greater for a volunteer
9 team to assemble, therefore making the rescue time much
10 longer when every second would matter that if we were to
11 survive. As most statistics show, that would be very
12 unlikely. I assume this is why MVP has no evacuation route,
13 as they know we could be incinerated.

PS3B2-9 | 14 Our household water comes directly from a
15 spring that could be directly impacted from blasting for the
16 pipeline, if approved. Our land is in the making of being

PS3B2-10 | 17 taken from us for mere change compared to generations of
18 hard work to protect it. Our safety will be in constant

PS3B2-11 | 19 danger. Our water supply may be affected and our safe haven
20 will no longer exist.

PS3B2-12 | 21 What happened to our rights as American
22 citizens? They were stolen from us when a law was slipped
23 through making eminent domain legal and apparently at no
24 cost. Who is going to protect the landowners? Our fresh
25 water, our national forests, our cultural attachment to our

PS3B2-8 Mountain Valley would maintain access for landowners. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND18-2 regarding emergency response.

PS3B2-9 Water resources, including springs, are discussed in section 4.3 of the EIS. See the response to comment CO14-1 regarding blasting.

PS3B2-10 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3B2-11 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3B2-12 See the response to comment IND1-3 regarding eminent domain. Cultural attachment is addressed in section 4.10 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

55

1 land?

2 I ask you to please to stop this pipeline and
3 please examine a safer route. Literally our lives are at
4 stake.

5 FERC: Thank you.

6 FERC: So if you could provide your first and
7 last name. Spell your first and last name.

8 MS. BROLSMA: It's Loretta, L O R E T T A B R
9 O L S M A.

10 FERC: And if you're here representing an
11 organization, if you could provide the name of the
12 organization; and then finally, if you are a landowner, if
13 you could provide your street address.

14 MS. BROLSMA: All right. I'm at 884 Hunter
15 Springs Road. In Greenville, West Virginia. I'm a member
16 of the Monroe Farm Market. I'm also a caver.

17 FERC: Then when you're ready to start your
18 verbal comment, start.

19 MS. BROLSMA: That's the reason why I'm here.
20 I'm an organic farmer. I sell my produce in Lewisberg and
21 in Charleston. The people that buy our stuff want high
22 quality. I use limestone water. It's well water. If I
23 used city water there would be chlorine in it and I can't
24 have chlorine for the plants. I also do hatched raised
25 chickens and dairy goats. That's what I was doing with

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 56

1 them.

PS3B2-13 | 2 And I know from being a caver that water
3 travels 40 miles underground. It doesn't even have to be
4 the pipeline, it can be the trucks that are coming and going
5 and everything else that -- this is a very high caving area
6 and it's just not a good place for the pipeline. I think a

PS3B2-14 | 7 better place, and I'm not opposed to the pipeline, but a
8 better place would be over the coal fields. Those people
9 would love to sell their land because they've already done

PS3B2-15 | 10 the bottom. It might not come out quite as good, but it's
11 not that far away. But Monroe County is not a good place
12 for these types of things because if we still do tourist and
13 do farm tours and that's it. That's pretty much my spiel.

14 FERC: All right. Thank you.

15 MS. LAREW: Last name Larew. L A R E W. All
16 one word. First name, Dorothy. Address, 6232 Greenville
17 Road, Greenville, West Virginia. 24945 We do have a farm
18 at that place. This is a picture of the barn on our farm.
19 A local artist painted the pink ribbon barn quilt in blue
20 and pink. This is an indication of how much the people of
21 Monroe county care for each other.

22 I got several comments but my main concern, and
23 I'm going to start at the bottom because that is most

PS3B2-16 | 24 important to me, is the water. I am concerned about the
25 potential for pollution of the water. Most of the county is

PS3B2-13 Organic farming is addressed in sections 2, 4.2, and 4.8 of the EIS. Karst is addressed in section 4.1 and groundwater is addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3B2-14 Section 4.1 discusses where the MVP pipeline route would be in the vicinity of coal mines.

PS3B2-15 See the response to comment IND332-1 regarding farming. Tourism is discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3B2-16 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water. Karst terrain is discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-16
cont'd

1 dependent on water either from Peters Mountain or private
2 wells; because of the Karst terrain in this area the entire
3 county, including the wells, could be damaged. You know, I
4 like oil, I like gas, the world can live without that. We
5 cannot live without good water.

6 Someone said one time that the next world war
7 is going to be fought over water. I can see that happening.
8 Other concerns including that family values mean a lot to
9 people in Monroe County. My husband was born here. I met
10 him at college at Berea, Kentucky. That's what got me here.
11 People, our children, all four of our children, went through
12 Monroe County school system, had to leave home for college,
13 employment. The two boys hope to get back here. The two
14 girls are going with their husband's families are. But
15 people do have to move away, but they want to return and
16 they do so.

17 Family reunions for example, bring back many
18 people year after year because of the closeness we feel.
19 The Larew family reunion every Fourth of July weekend has
20 between 100 and 150 people coming back; and believe me it's
21 wall-to-wall sleeping bags all over the creek for people to

PS3B2-17

22 be there. If the ugliness of that big thing across Peters
23 Mountain -- and there's also a feeling that there might be
24 additional lines, wires that kind of thing going through
25 that corridor, it would be damaging to the tourism of the

PS3B2-17

After pipeline installation underground, the right-of-way would be restored and revegetated. Visual impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in section 4.8 of the draft EIS. If approved, the applicants would only be permitted to install one natural gas pipeline within the right-of-way (see recommended condition 4 in section 5.2). Tourism is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 58

PS3B2-17
cont'd

1 county, the people who love the county are not going to
2 drive hundreds of miles to see that. They want to see the
3 mountains that they grew up with.

PS3B2-18

4 Safety. I'm concerned about accidents. This
5 is being built near the only high school in the county and
6 near two nursing homes with many bed fast patients. Just
7 this week -- I had read this, and I'll take that back from
8 you because it's the only copy -- that in the past five
9 years there have been 3300 leaks and ruptures in pipelines.
10 There have been 80 deaths. There have been 389 injuries --
11 and this is just, it's just too dangerous to think.

PS3B2-19

12 There's also the damage to forest, to wildlife.
13 We have protected wildlife in this area. We have a bald
14 eagle nest on our farm. The aesthetic value is discouraging

PS3B2-20

15 to people. Is it really needed? There are other forms of
16 shipment. The destination of this is port in Virginia. It
17 can easily be shipped overseas. I know it sounds selfish,

PS3B2-21

18 but part of me wants to keep this in the ground for use of
19 the people of this country in the future when we need it.

PS3B2-22

20 There are alternate sources of energy. There is huge money
21 in manufacturing of solar and wind, and this income would
22 offset the loss of money from the drilling. So, these are
23 all things that I'm quite concerned about.

24 FERC: Thank you.
25 <>

PS3B2-18 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PS3B2-19 See the response to comment IND155-2 regarding forest impacts.
See the response to comment IND270-1 regarding wildlife.

PS3B2-20 See the response to comment FA11-12 regarding need.

PS3B2-21 See the response to comment IND2-3 regarding export.

PS3B2-22 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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 FERC: All right. If you could provide your
2 first and last name.
3 MR. HALL: Willis Hall. H A L L. Can I start?
4 FERC: If you are representing an
5 organization..
6 MR. HALL: I'm here as a concerned citizen of
7 the county.
8 FERC: And if you're a landowner if you could
9 provide your address
10 MR. HALL: Route 1. Box 240F. Glenside, West
11 Virginia. 24951.
12 FERC: All right and then when you're ready
13 we'll start your three minutes. All right.
14 MR. HALL: Let me get my glasses on.
15 Information sent to FERC as part of the scoping process in
16 June 2015 included a map and information about the St. Clair
17 fault. The St. Clair fault is an ancient thrust fault. It
18 is not mentioned in the DEIS. The MVP's Resource Report 6.
19 It is said that modern earthquake hazard analysis no longer
20 refers to GCSZ and instead identifies the Pembroke fault
21 zone, PSZ, as the focal point of this seismic area. Then
22 the DEIS, the Pembroke fault zone is barely mentioned but
23 the GCSZ Giles County seismic zone is mentioned many times.
24 The DEIS Table 21-2 states that Monroe County
25 West Virginia MP range is 173.42 195.4 For a total of 22

PS3B2-23

PS3B2-23

See the response to comment IND251-1 regarding earthquakes and the St. Clair fault.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 miles. Information within these DEIS covering the Giles
2 County zone, GCZSZ located between MP 165 and 230 is
3 included in the following. 4.1.1.5 Geologic hazards include
4 seismic and soil liquification. 4.1.1.7 Jefferson National
5 Forest. 4.1.2.4 Slopes and land potential. 4.1.2.3.
6 Seismic and potential for soil liquification. In the DEIS
7 ES3 executive summary regarding impacts and mitigation, a
8 recommendation was made about the GCSZ, it said:

9 Geology and social GCSZ about 30 percent of the
10 MVP pipeline route and 48 percent of the EEP pipeline would
11 cross topographic with slopes greater than 15 percent grade,
12 about 67 percent of the MVP pipeline route. All of the EEP
13 Pipelines would cross area susceptible to landslide. The
14 application would implement specific construction methods
15 for crossing steep, be revised to include an analysis of the
16 potential landslide hazards in the Giles County seismic
17 zone. Peters Mountain, Sinking Mountain, and Brush
18 Mountain.

PS3B2-24

19 Monroe County was not covered with the DEIS
20 regarding issues discussed. Monroe County is totally within
21 the GCSZ. The geologic hazard includes seismic EG
22 earthquakes, surface faults, soil liquification, landslides,
23 flash flooding, Karst terrain, cave spring substances, and
24 shallow bedrock. The DEIS is missing a lot of potential
25 information about our county, Monroe County West Virginia.

PS3B2-24

. The EIS provides a discussion of earthquakes, faults, landslides, soil liquefaction, karst and shallow bedrock in section 4.1. A revised discussion of flash flooding is provided in section 4.3.2 of the EIS. The Giles County Seismic Zone is addressed in section 4.1 of the EIS

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

61

1 Thank you. Willis Hall.

2 FERC: Thank you, sir.

3 MR. PARSONS: My name is Harold Parsons. H A R

4 O L D. P A R S O N S. I go by the nickname of Rocky. My

5 address is 960 Broad Run. Sinks Grove, West Virginia.

6 24976. I'm representing myself.

7 FERC: When you're ready, I'll start.

8 MR. PARSONS: Oh, all right. I'm ready. I

9 offer the following comments for the Federal Energy

10 Regulatory Commission's public comments session on the

11 proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline. November 3rd, 2016 in

12 Peterstown, West Virginia. That's Docket CP16-10-000. I'm

13 a geologist and a caver. I'm retired from a 37 year career

14 with West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection's

15 Office of Mining and Reclamation.

16 I started out as a reclamation inspector in

17 Mingo County, transferred to North Central West Virginia

18 where I worked my way up to the position of deputy director.

19 In that capacity I managed a regional office that was

20 responsible for the permit review and enforcement of all

21 laws and regulations to pertain to all coal mining and

22 quarry mining operations for a 37 county area of Northern

23 West Virginia. I am now a resident of Monroe County.

24 When I became aware of the proposed route of

25 the Mountain Valley Pipeline across Peters Mountain, I

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 became concerned about the impacts of such a large
2 disturbance on the fragile Karst topography and hydrology of
3 the area. Layers of limestone and dolomite outcrop along
4 the contour of the eastern flank of Peters Mountain.

5 As the water runoff and precipitation events
6 flows off the mountain and encounters these outcrops, the
7 water sinks into the limestone and dolomite via solution
8 conduits and caves and enters the water table. This water
9 resurge is as large springs that serves as the source water
10 for many residents, and particularly the primary and
11 secondary water intakes for the Red Sulfur Public Service
12 District. The Red Sulfur Public Service District provides
13 the water supply for almost one fourth of the county's
14 population.

PS3B2-25

15 My experience with regulating environmental
16 impacts associated with mining operations has taught me that
17 the large extent of surface disturbance necessary for
18 construction of an 125-foot wide pipeline corridor will, if
19 not properly managed, result in significant problems with
20 sediment, suspended solids, and other contaminants. A
21 disturbance of this magnitude by a mining operation would
22 require the construction of a comprehensive drain control
23 system that is designed based upon the size of the
24 disturbance, steepness of the slope and several other
25 factors.

PS3B2-25

Steep slopes and karst 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. See also the response to comment IND152-1 regarding the FERC's third-party monitoring program.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-25
cont'd

1 Trying to control erosion from such a large
2 surface disturbance using best management practices will be
3 woefully inadequate. Regardless of the extent of the
4 sediment control system, the disturbance will continue to
5 produce suspended solids until the area is reclaimed,
6 stabilized, and a permanent revegetation cover is
7 established.

8 On January 13th, 2015, I made arrangements for
9 a representatives of Mountain Valley Pipeline to meet with
10 representatives of the Red Sulfur Public Service District to
11 discuss the proposed pipeline route and what impact it would
12 have on the recharge areas for these springs. On May 6th,
13 2015, I made arrangements for representatives of the FERC to
14 meet with representatives for the Red Sulfur Public Service
15 District, the town of Union and a local bottling plant.

16 The FERC representatives were shown a
17 PowerPoint presentation outlining the building of the
18 recharge area for the springs that serve as the principal
19 water sources for the Red Sulfur Public Service District and
20 how construction of a pipeline corridor would cause
21 significant impacts from sediments, suspended solids, and
22 other contaminants. The FERC representatives were given a
23 tour of the east flank of Peters Mountain, showing them the
24 absence of service streams and the presence of springs that
25 are so important for the citizens of Southern Monroe County.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 64

PS3B2-26 | 1 Upon reviewing FERC's Draft Environmental
2 Impact Statement, I was disappointed to see that none of
3 these issues concerning the vulnerability of Red Sulfur
4 Public Service District's recharge area had been addressed.

PS3B2-27 | 5 Another area of concern is Mountain Valley's proposal for a
6 500 foot utility corridor through Jefferson National Forest.
7 It would, if approved, encourage other pipeline and utility
8 companies to route their rights of way across the same
9 vulnerable Karst recharge area , further compounding the
10 problem of pollution having an adverse effect on the Red
11 Sulfur Public Service District's water supply as well as
12 numerous private water supplies.

13 I strongly encourage FERC not to allow Mountain
14 Valley to route their pipeline across Peters Mountain. I
15 also recommend that the Forest Service not approve the 500
16 foot utility corridor. Thank you for the opportunity to
17 provide my comments.

18 FERC: Thank you, sir.

19 MS. COVINGTON: My name is Beth, B E T H, last
20 name Covington, C O V I N G T O N. I am an affected
21 landowner. I live about a quarter mile away from the
22 proposed route. I am a member of a number of pipeline
23 fighting groups. Save Monroe is the one that I'm with right
24 now.

25 FERC: If you could provide your street

PS3B2-26

The meeting between the FERC, the Red Sulphur PSD, and the Town of Union was discussed in section 1.4 of the EIS. Section 4.3 of the EIS provided information about intakes for the Red Sulphur PSD as well as proposed mitigation.

PS3B2-27

See the response to comment FA8-1 regarding the 500-foot-wide utility corridor in the Jefferson National Forest.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 address.

2 MS. COVINGTON: It is 1372 Wildwater, one
3 word, Farms Road.

4 FERC: Then when you're ready you can start
5 with your three minutes.

6 MS. COVINGTON: I want to get myself unfolded
7 here. See how much I had to edit? All right. One, two,
8 three, go. I wish to address a topic which seems to have
9 been overlooked in the incomplete, premature, boilerplate,

PS3B2-28

10 factually challenged DEIS. That topic is Appalachian Lives
11 Matter. Environmental justice is a term I just learned.
12 Although I have been feeling the effects of it since 2014
13 when MVP first announced its intentions to rip my beautiful
14 West Virginia Mountain neighborhood to shreds. My current
15 personal experience is of environmental injustice. A
16 gargantuan gas corporation with a ton of money and political
17 power has decided that they want to plow their project
18 through central Appalachia. While their stated goal is to
19 supply, quote, markets in the mid and south Atlantic,
20 unquote, they are for some reason trying to route their
21 behemoth project from the frack fields, nearly due south.

PS3B2-28

See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. Environmental justice is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PS3B2-29

22 Looking at the map, I see that the shortest
23 route for them to reach the mid-atlantic, is to head due
24 east. Now why in the world would they go twice as far?
25 Apparently because they believe that Appalachian Americans

PS3B2-29

Section 3 discussed the route selection process. The point of the pipeline is to transport natural gas from Wetzel County, West Virginia to Transco Station 165 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

66

1 don't have the wherewithal to fight back. Somewhat like the
2 Standing Rock Sioux who have been targeted by the Dakota
3 Access Pipeline, now attempting to cross their ancestral
4 lands in North Dakota. Both are disempowered,
5 disenfranchised, cultures.

6 The corporate bigwigs see a place where the
7 folks are poor, are less well-educated and they consider us
8 to be just a bunch of dumb hillbillies. They think our
9 lives don't matter, as evidenced by their choice of use of
10 thinner walled pipe in areas of lower population, i.e.,
11 rural areas. They think we are pushovers, easily beaten, as
12 shown by their vague, cavalier, pseudoscientific, erroneous
13 DEIS comments about, quote, "mitigating," end quote, just
14 about everything.

15 We may not have book learning but we know a lie
16 when we hear it. In the not so distant past some folks here
17 signed legal papers with their thumbprint. How could you
18 expect them to read an 800 page DEIS with thousands of pages
19 of appendices in language so convoluted, technical and
20 cumbersome that it seems to be written in a foreign
21 language? Some folks are already cowed and beaten into
22 submission by a culture of victimization and dealings with
23 extractive industries and crooked politicians.

24 I am here to tell you that Appalachian lives do
25 matter. As a former city slicker, I can testify that the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

67

1 quality and culture of people here far outshines that of the
2 urban dwellers who rob, rape, and murder each other at an
3 alarming rate. The sad thing is that many of those city
4 folks don't even acknowledge or help their neighbors and
5 they don't know where their food or water come from unless
6 it gets contaminated. My rural Appalachian friends may not
7 have big bank accounts or fancy houses, but they have taught
8 me how to love and care, the highest purpose of human life.

PS3B2-30

9 I urge you to create a supplemental DEIS in
10 which you require MVP to explain their choice of route more
11 honestly, and address the very real issue of environmental
12 justice. I also request that they research and write a
13 highly detailed report about why on earth West Virginian
14 Appalachian Americans could possibly need or benefit from
15 the proposed project when they already live in 'almost
16 heaven.'

17 Thank you for listening and I will send
18 additional comments with more details but this is the topic
19 that I wanted to address today.

20 FERC: Thank you.

21 MS. ELLIOTT: This is for Ruth Murphy. And she
22 lives on Court Street in Lewisberg, Greenbriar County, West
23 Virginia. And I will give you the house number here.

24 FERC: It's fine. That's fine.

25 MS. ELLIOTT: No, I won't. I don't have it but

PS3B2-30

The final EIS revises the draft to address comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 68

1 it is on Court Street in Lewisberg, West Virginia.

2 FERC: When you're ready for her comment.

3 MS. MURPHY: I'm just going to read:

4 Attention, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I am a

5 93-year old resident of West Virginia with grave concerns

6 about the environmental impact on this region due to

7 construction of the pipeline. Due to the fact that it is

8 Karst soil with steep slopes and seismic hazards,

9 earthquakes, and has already been qualified by geologists as

10 a no-build zone.

11 I'm concerned about the longevity of the

12 environment that will be used in the construction of this

13 pipeline. Oh, excuse me, the longevity of the equipment

14 that will be used in the construction of this pipeline. I

15 am also concerned about the maintaining of the pipeline.

16 Lastly, I'm concerned about what will happen when the

17 pipeline deconstructs and causes enormous pollution. What

18 will become of this beautiful water source land? Please

19 take all the concerns into consideration before moving

20 forward with the construction of this pipeline and

21 destroying our beautiful land. Sincerely, Ruth Murphy.

22 MS. ELLIOTT: So, specifically she was

23 concerned with after the pipeline is built, how long the

24 equipment will last without some damage. Everybody knows

25 that it's only good for so many years before something's

PS3B2-31

PS3B2-31

Section 4.1 of the EIS provides a discussion of karst, steep slopes, and earthquakes. There is no such thing as a “no build zone.”

PS3B2-32

PS3B2-32

As stated in section 2.7 of the EIS, the useful life of the projects is expected to be about 50 years. Monitoring is discussed in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PS3B2-33

PS3B2-33

The EIS concluded that for most resources there would not be significant adverse effects.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

69

1 going to happen somewhere along the line, and she's a very
2 strong advocate of clean environment, clean water.

3 FERC: All right. So, now we'll switch gears
4 to you?

5 MS. ELLIOTT: All right. Yes, we can switch
6 gears to me.

7 FERC: So, it's the same thing, three minutes,
8 but prior to that..

9 MS. ELLIOTT: How long did that one take?

10 FERC: Like a minute and a half.

11 MS. ELLIOTT: All right. So I know how long
12 to go. Because it's hard to decide where three is.

13 FERC: When you're ready if you can provide
14 and spell your first and last name. If you're here
15 representing an organization, if you could provide the name
16 of the organization. And if you're a landowner, if you
17 could provide your address.

18 MS. ELLIOTT: All right. I can do that.

19 FERC: All right. Whenever you're ready.

20 MS. ELLIOTT: All right. My name is Denise
21 Elliott. Two L's, two T's, and I am a landowner, and I live
22 on 1040 Chestnut Flats Road. Lewisberg, Greenbriar County,
23 West Virginia. And I'm another concerned citizen about
24 water, and water resources.

25 On my property I have a spring. That spring

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 70

1 feeds my pond, and it is pristine water. It is beautiful.
2 Where that comes from is really hard to say. When you're
3 looking at the topography around my pond and that spring, it
4 might bring in some of the water but it certainly doesn't
5 bring in the quantity of water that that spring carries. So
6 the question is, where is it coming from? How far away, and
7 where would environmental impacts that would effect my
8 spring?

9 So when we're looking at something like Peters
10 Mountain, and it has springs on it as well ,too, I'm
11 concerned about the water for those people. Has anyone
12 looked at those springs and said, 'Oh, yes, this draws from
13 this area' and this draws from that area.' So that they
14 would know that these were areas that needed to be protected
15 or in case of an accident that it would need to be notified
16 immediately, something done to, you know, improve their
17 water source. And you're talking about the construction of
18 a pipeline that will have leaks. The pipeline in Alabama
19 has had five leaks so far this year. And an explosion.
20 It's not as if these things won't happen, they do. They do
21 happen.

22 So, I don't think that they've investigated
23 enough the potential for a serious amount of damage. And I
24 don't think that they have prepared a plan for what to do
25 when things go bad. You know, what is their contingency?

PS3B2-34

PS3B2-34 See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

PS3B2-35

PS3B2-35 Springs are addressed in section 4.3 of the EIS.

PS3B2-36

PS3B2-36 See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-37

1 Say, like on a slope that's really steep slope and you got a
2 pipeline running down it, it starts leaking, how are you
3 going to get equipment up there? Back on that slope,
4 quickly to eliminate the leak. How are you going to follow
5 that leak?

6 One thing I want to say. I have personally
7 been through an area where a gas tanker overturned on a
8 highway. That area was damaged for a long period of time.
9 As much as they fought to clean it up, driving through there

PS3B2-38

10 like a month later, you could still smell the gas. So, you
11 not only have problems with the water quality, you have
12 problems with the air quality and as much as somebody wants
13 to come in and correct a problem, they can't.

14 MR. BERKLEY: My name is Oris Ashby Berkley.
15 My address is.--

16 FERC: If you could spell your name.

17 MR. BERKLEY: Spell my name is O R U S. Middle
18 name is Ashby, A S H B Y. Last name is Berkley, B E R K L E
19 Y. I live in Pence Springs, Summers County, West Virginia.
20 And in Sweet Springs, Monroe County, West Virginia. I'm a
21 business man. I'm president of Resorts Management Company,
22 Incorporated which is headquartered in Pence Springs, West
23 Virginia. The new, I'm sorry, the Sweet Springs Resort Park
24 Foundation, Incorporated, at 501-C3 in Monroe County.

25 FERC: Whenever you're ready.

PS3B2-37

See the response to comment IND334-3 regarding MLVs which would isolate an area believed to be leaking.

PS3B2-38

The pipeline would transport vaporized natural gas. See the response to comment IND179-2 regarding a release of gas.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 72

1 MR. BERKLEY: You don't need addresses?
2 FERC: Oh, if you have addresses, sure.
3 MR. BERKLEY: My address, I can be reached at
4 either place, but my address in Pence Springs for the
5 Resorts Management is Post Office Box 366, Talcott, T A L C
6 O T T , West Virginia, 24981. My address in Sweet Springs
7 is 19540 Sweet Springs Road, Gap Mills, West Virginia,
8 24941.
9 I am opposed to the Mountain Valley Pipeline
10 for the following reasons. Number one, it is crossing
11 Keeney's Knob over my ancestral home. We've been there
12 since 1825 and it's coming right through our property, which
13 has been a reserve since my grandfather died about 1950. If
14 affects more than three hundred family members. It will
15 come through Pence Springs and is crossing the river on my
16 property at Pence Springs. Crossing the Greenbriar River.
17 I restored the Pence Springs Historic Hotel and
18 Historic District, and at that time, I donated over \$200,000
19 to the Big Ben Public Service water company to furnish water
20 to the community, and over \$185,000 to the sewer system to
21 accommodate the historic district and the factory in Pence
22 Springs, and the community. The pipeline will cross the
23 river there, go under the railroad track. It's, the blast
24 radius for that would take out the entire village of Pence
25 Springs.

PS3B2-39

PS3B2-39

The Beckley House at Kinney Knob is about 5,000 feet away from the pipeline. The Pence Spring Hotel Historic District is discussed in section 4.10 of the EIS. The crossing of the Greenbrier River in section 4.3.

PS3B2-40

PS3B2-40

The old Sweet Springs Resort is 23 miles away from the pipeline. See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 In Sweet Springs, Monroe County, I'm at the
2 foot of Peters Mountain and in charge of a \$50 million
3 resort compound. 500 acres of that compound will be used
4 for disadvantaged and inner city children for sports
5 training. We have a water bottling plant there at that
6 location. And that bottling plant will be manned by
7 veterans and the water will be exported out of the country
8 to Europe and in the United States. That water in the
9 Peters Mountain aquifer has been entered in the
10 international water tasting contest which has been going on
11 for 25 years. It has never placed below third. It's always
12 placed between first and third of the best waters in the
13 world. It cannot be replaced.

PS3B2-41

14 If anything would affect the aquifer in Peters
15 Mountain that affected that water, it would be a sin. The
16 water aquifer there produces more than one million gallons
17 of water a minute. All right. As citizens we will not
18 accept this intrusion. West Virginia has been shunned and
19 made fun of, and is always on the bottom of the list. If
20 you will remember, the civil war created West Virginia. We
21 were the only state that was created by Presidential
22 Proclamation. We do not want another Civil War. We don't
23 want a war --. (timer).

24 FERC: Thank you, sir.

25 THE REPORTER: You can finish your sentence.

PS3B2-41

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

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 MR. BERKLEY: We don't want a war here like
2 they've got in North Dakota. We're peaceful people, but I'm
3 telling you we will have a war if this happens. I mean, and
4 I'm 75 years old. I'm retired. I spent my life
5 contributing to the community. I've never drawn a company
6 salary. I've worked my entire life and I'll tell you one
7 thing right now, I'll be on the front lines. Because we're
8 not going to stand for it. This is a sin. Thank you.

9 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Maury Johnson. M A U
10 R Y J O H N S O N. I'm an affected landowner. As I said
11 last night that the Summerville; it's almost in my back
12 yard. My address is 3227 Ellisons Ridge Road, Greenville,
13 West Virginia. I'm a member of Preserve Monroe, Save
14 Monroe, Discover Monroe team, Power, the Coalition, and a
15 small group that just got started called Save -- of Hans
16 Creek and the Beautiful Hans Creek Valley.

17 FERC: Whenever you're ready.

18 MR. JOHNSON: I'm ready. I'm commenting to
19 object to the DEIS for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
20 Docket CP1610-000 which I believe was issued prematurely on
21 September 16th, 2016. Mountain Valley Pipeline LLC has not
22 provided critical information required in response to
23 questions raised by FERC staff, by the US Forest Service, by
24 other agencies, groups and individuals. The fact that a 90
25 day comment period has been announced does not make this

PS3B2-42

PS3B2-42

See the response to comment FA11-2 and LA5-1 regarding preparation of the draft EIS. See the response to comment LA3-1 regarding the comment period.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

75

1 problem go away. It only means that once again the public
2 will have to trudge through thousands of pages of minutia,
3 all the time knowing that the analysis by FERC staff rests
4 on inadequate, missing, and incorrect data. I will provide
5 specific examples in future comments and filings.

6 Furthermore, in April 2016 the FERC released a
7 draft environmental impact statement for the Leach Xpress
8 Pipeline. On 6-13-2016 the EPA submitted comments to FERC
9 rating the Leach Xpress DEIS to be inadequate, insufficient
10 and of concern. On 9-1-2016 FERC released the final
11 environmental impact statement to the Leach. On 10-18-2016
12 the EPA submitted comments to the FERC, finding the FEIS
13 also to be inadequate and insufficient.

14 Particularly with respect to greenhouse gases,
15 emissions, climate change, wetland mitigation, migratory
16 bird plan, etcetera. The EPA recommended that FERC go back
17 yet again to rework the FEIS, and they cautioned FERC about
18 releasing similarly deficient DEISs for other pipelines. As
19 of September 21st, 2016, all federal departments and agents
20 are to perform certain functions to ensure that climate
21 change-related impacts are fully considered in the
22 development of national security doctrine policies and
23 plans. Also the memorandum for the heads of executive
24 departments and agencies, which includes FERC and the EPA.
25 This memorandum establishes a framework and directs federal

PS3B2-43

PS3B2-43

GHGs and climate change are addressed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 76

PS3B2-43 cont'd

1 departments and agencies to serve certain functions to
2 ensure that climate change-related impacts are fully
3 considered in the development of national security doctrine,
4 policies and plans. And I have that here and I've got the
5 website listed.

6 Apparently, FERC has not taken this
7 recommendation seriously and has once again released a DEIS
8 for the Mountain Valley Pipeline with these and other
9 important information missing. He does want to talk about
10 the NEPA regulations, and I will hand these, with a
11 statement to you, so that you can completely read it. I'm
12 taking up some time here, about to finalize.

PS3B2-44

13 In the case of the MVP, the extent of missing
14 materials require an entirely new revised DEIS and a new
15 public comment period resulting in a colossal and
16 unnecessary waste of time and money by FERC and cooperating
17 agencies. I was a former teacher. If I had students who
18 did not complete their assignments the way FERC has not
19 completed this, I'd have given them a failing grade. They
20 need to take more action on this or really start all over
21 again.

PS3B2-45

22 So I called FERC to make the no-action. I call
23 on FERC to make the no-action call now and to withdraw the
24 current DEIS and restart the process after MVP has finished
25 its homework. So I'm handing you the President Obama

PS3B2-44 The final EIS revised the draft to include newly filed information.

PS3B2-45 The no-action alternative is discussed in section 3 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

77

1 memorandum from September 21st, I want this in the record.

2 I know you all know this, but I want this in the record.

3 August 1st, 2016, the NEPA regulations that come from the

4 Council on Environmental Quality..

5 .

6 MS. BRAUN: My name is Carly Ann Braun. C A R L

7 Y, A N N, B R A U N. I am not here representing an

8 organization and I do not own the land that I live on.

9 FERC: All right. When you're ready.

10 MS. BRAUN: Great. So, I have been living in

11 Appalachia for the last 13 months, and I know that these

12 hills are valuable to humankind both ecologically and,

13 ecologically from a scientific perspective, and spiritually.

14 The first time I saw the Appalachian Mountains I was 16

15 years old on a mission trip to Kentucky and I can still

16 remember that one lane road, slick with morning dew and the

17 hills rising straight up like walls on either side, lush and

18 greener than any woods I'd ever seen. Besides feeling

19 terrified at the wet pavement and the winding roads, as

20 Appalachian visitors often are, I felt in awe of the

21 beautiful and tangible sanctity of these hills.

22 So when I graduated college and was looking for

23 a job, the Appalachian mountains called me back once again.

24 I worked on a farm called Bethlehem Farm. It's a Catholic

25 retreat center in Pence Springs in Summers County, West

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 Virginia. We bring in over 400 volunteers from all across
2 the country from California to New York, from Texas to
3 Alaska. The amount of spiritual food that these high
4 schoolers, college kids, and adults, volunteers, receive in
5 their time here never ceases to astound me.

6 At the end of every group's week here we heard
7 over and over again that these people experienced God in a
8 way that they never could have at home. I believe that the
9 biodiversity of the Allegheny Mountain Range and the
10 benefits it serves as an ecological sanctuary would be
11 damaged by this pipeline. Bethlehem Farm has existed for
12 ten years, and before that it was a Catholic worker farm,
13 meaning it was a place for people in need of mental,
14 physical, and spiritual rehabilitation to come for healing.
15 For more than twenty years people from all over the country
16 have been coming to these fifty acres in the mountains to
17 experience a spiritual nourishment that these mountains have
18 to give; and I can only imagine how the construction of this
19 pipeline would deeply destruct the serenity of our retreat
20 center.

21 The pipeline has been proposed to come within a
22 half mile of our property on two different routes. I am
23 first off concerned about the safety of our volunteers.
24 People who have never driven on mountain roads before will
25 be trying to pass heavy duty construction equipment on a one

PS3B2-46

PS3B2-46

The proposed Mountain Valley pipeline route would not cross the Allegheny Mountain Range. The EIS concluded that for most resources there would not be significant adverse effects.

PS3B2-47

PS3B2-47

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Traffic is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016 79

1 land road, which is not designed for massive trucks or
2 machinery anyway. This is especially worrisome because our
3 busiest season is March through August, which is also the
4 time most of the construction takes place. Not to mention
5 the noise and other disturbances caused by construction that
6 would essentially eliminate the peaceful beauty and silence
7 of our property, which is one of its greatest assets.

8 And that is just the tip of the iceberg. The
9 reports about the long term dangers of this pipeline are
10 incredibly worrying. It is true that pipelines are at a
11 risk of exploding or releasing petrochemicals into the
12 ground water.

13 (Additional statement to be submitted)

14 MS. HOUCHINS: My name is Heather Houchins. H
15 E A T H E R, H O U C H I N S. All right. I am a landowner.
16 My address 3138 Back Valley Road. Linside, West Virginia,
17 24951.

18 FERC: When you're ready.

19 MS. HOUCHINS: I just wanted to place my
20 personal comments in. I do live 1.8 miles away from the
21 proposed pipeline. Coming from a large city -- I grew up in
22 Fort Lauderdale, Florida -- I came here ---and I'm going to
23 tear up. I came here for a simpler life and I came up here
24 and finished school to be a teacher. I love this community.
25 I love our children. This is a beautiful community to live

PS3B2-48

PS3B2-48

Noise is addressed in section 4.11.2 of the EIS.

PS3B2-49

PS3B2-49

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. See the response to comment IND92-1 regarding leaks.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 in, beautiful people. There's amazing farmers, my
2 co-worker raises bees. There's great people who raise
3 gardens and organic foods. I know many people who raise
4 chickens, cows. I'm getting into the dairy goat business
5 myself.

6 All this would be destroyed, I feel, if the
7 pipeline came through. You will be destroying a perfect
8 piece of America. And it's history. My family moved here
9 from England in 1790. Like said, I did grow up in Fort
10 Lauderdale, Florida but I came home. I came home to where
11 people knew how to pronounce my last name. Where my last
12 name was known and my family was known. It's got a lot more

PS3B2-50

13 to do with money. It's about people and it's about our
14 water and our way of life. If we don't have water we don't
15 have anything. We have nothing. The pipeline may destroy
16 our water.

PS3B2-50

The EIS concluded that MVP would not have significant adverse impacts on most resources (except for the clearing of forest). Water resources, including wells and springs, are discussed in section 4.3. See the response to comment IND3-1 regarding drinking water.

17 I live on a well. Sometimes my well is iffy
18 nowadays anyways. It scares me to know that my animals, my
19 neighbors, I will not have water. It's really scary and I
20 wish, it's not going through your back yard -- it's not
21 going through your back yard, it's going through mine. It's
22 going through what America built and it's going through what

PS3B2-51

23 America needs to get back to. We need to get to clean
24 energy. We need to stop using non-renewable resources.
25 West Virginia's already been through this with coal. It's

PS3B2-51

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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

81

1 not the right thing to do. And I know it's all about money.
2 We need to find a money-maker in renewable energy. That's
3 all I have to say because I'm going to get upset, more upset
4 than I am now.

5 FERC: Thank you.

6 MS. SACCO: My name is Rosanna Sacco, R O S E A
7 N N A, S A C C O. I'm representing myself. I am a
8 landowner. I'm nowhere near the pipeline route in Sweet
9 Springs. The address is 626 Cove Creek Road. And that's in
10 Sweet Springs, West Virginia. 24921.

11 FERC: When you're ready.

12 MS. SACCO: All right. I looked through this
13 DEIS here. I did want to say that it's amazing that you've
14 gotten this document together with all this information.
15 It's just extraordinary. But in looking through it
16 carefully I determined some things. One is that taking
17 climate change seriously is relatively new to human
18 endeavor. You know? We've just started to see the really
19 the real science behind it. Although, the Council on
20 Environmental Quality referred to it back in the 1970's in
21 their first annual report where they said that there is,
22 they actually asked a question, they said, "Man is changing
23 his weather." That's how they referred to it at that time.

24 And there's, since the publication of that
25 first report it has been determined that human activities

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

82

1 have caused the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere of
2 our planet to increase to its highest level in at least
3 800,000 years. So, that's a significant thing that has
4 happened and we're now really entering into the awareness of
5 it. So, what's happening now is that new contributing
6 factors are constantly being discovered. Last year we
7 thought we knew this and now we're discovering this.

8 I'd just like to give two examples; one is the
9 crystal methane in the icebergs; now we all know that the
10 climate change, the increased temperatures are causing the
11 icebergs to melt. And as they melt they're releasing a lot
12 of water which is then causing an increase in the bodies of
13 water, are now becoming bigger, therefore there is a greater
14 surface that's evaporating up and then various things occur;
15 winds, accumulation of clouds, and you have all the sudden
16 some kind of flooding or coastal rising, et cetera.

17 So, the fact that that is occurring is, it's
18 causing a double vice versa-type effect. As one thing
19 occurs, something else is occurring, but then that compounds
20 the original thing that has occurred. And one of the things
21 that's occurring is that as those icebergs melt, they're
22 releasing methane into the atmosphere because there's
23 crystal methane, crystalline form of methane, that's in
24 those, captured in each little piece of ice that is being
25 released into the atmosphere. So you have double things

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

83

1 going on.

2 Another thing that wasn't realized, for
3 example, in certain reports on the amount of greenhouse gas
4 emissions that were being released by the icebergs melting
5 is that they're not only melting when they do the computer
6 analysis. They're not only melting in summer when the
7 temperatures are the highest, but they're also melting in
8 winter. So, when they factor in the winter, a few years
9 later, things have changed.

PS3B2-52

10 So, basically I'm here to say that FERC has
11 definitely addressed the climate change factor in this book
12 here and they've taken into and cited the reference which is
13 this paper that was released by the Executive Office of the
14 President, the Council on Environmental Quality, and it has
15 been recognized by NEPA, the National Environmental Policy
16 Act regulations who then wrote this, has authorized this
17 paper, that is to act as guidelines for the agencies that
18 are involved in the review process. I looked at this with
19 regards for what I saw in here and I've realized that there
20 are some things that need to be done to ameliorate the
21 extent to which this has been taken into account in the
22 DEIS.

23 FERC: Can we conclude our comment?

24 MS. SACCO: Oh, really? Wow. That goes fast.

25 All right, well, then we'll just conclude by

PS3B2-52

GHGs and climate change are discussed in sections 4.11 and 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

84

1 saying that there is a lot to do. They are recommending
2 taking into account the effect of climate change on a
3 proposed action. So, for example, if we were to build this
4 pipeline, the pipeline itself will be releasing more
5 greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere, but because
6 right now the human species needs to focus on moving people
7 away from areas that are susceptible to the effects of
8 climate change rather than on keeping them locked -- and
9 this is a very important point -- locked into a consumer
10 cycle of endless consumption; and most of the gas in this
11 pipeline would be used to make products that people have to
12 continually buy because this one here is plastic with a
13 handle broke off, and you wind up having to buy twenty of
14 these in a lifetime, if not more depending on how lucky you
15 are in terms of how long you live. Whereas we have the
16 ability to produce one like this, that could go from
17 great-great-grandmother down to great-great-grandchild.

18 We have allowed ourselves to move on with this
19 because there's a desire to keep working. It's just a
20 nonsensical junk economy to a certain extent, that if we
21 stop, look and listen, even the people who want to do this
22 pipeline, could say, "Why should we keep on doing pipelines,
23 we're doing pipelines so good?" Now we could turn our
24 creativity -- because they have creativity -- and the
25 ability to manifest. These people are brilliant. The guy

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

85

PS3B2-53

1 who came up with the idea of fracking is brilliant. Can
2 you imagine that we could do such a thing? But now when we
3 see what it's doing to the climate and the suffering that is
4 being engendered, we could shift. These people could shift
5 over to solar, wind, and other -- passive solar, wave
6 energy, all kinds of things. And they could do as many
7 brilliant things with that and they would be the stars of
8 the entire planet. It's time, they have to let go of this.
9 It's not going to work.

10 FERC: If you have additional comments --

11 MS. SACCO: I know, to put them in, yes.

12 Thank you for letting me go over a little. All
13 right. There was a lot more to say.

14 MS. SOUTH: My name is Amy South, first name
15 Amy, A M Y. Last name South, S O U T H. I am a landowner
16 on Peters Mountain. I am with the Board of Conservancy,
17 although I can speak for myself a lot, too. My address is
18 1093 Peters Mountain Drive, Union, West Virginia. 24983.

19 FERC: And when you're ready.

20 MS. SOUTH: All right. Yes, I just want to
21 speak that I was raised on Peters Mountain and I have
22 instilled in me the love of that mountain that my mother and
23 father had when they had to move away and leave this county
24 in order to work to provide to come back to county.

25 And our water, I've been drinking that water

PS3B2-53

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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

86

1 forever since I was a youngin' and it's the best that there
2 is, and that's one of our worries, is the water. And just
3 our natural way of life, you know? Water, our way of life,
4 and Peters Mountain, those are the three main things in my
5 life and I want to see them protected because when I'm gone,
6 I want the next person to be able to have what I have. In
7 water, we're blessed with water that if it's taken away and
8 Peters Mountain is destroyed, you know, what have we got?
9 Nothing. You're looking at what, 66 percent almost of this
10 county drinking off of Peters Mountain. The aquifer that
11 runs underneath it is just an amazing thing, and we have
12 something that's freshest that nobody has.

PS3B2-54

13 A lot of people ,and they're needing water
14 moreso then I think that they're needing gas, and I just
15 wanted to come down here and speak about that because I
16 fought for this mountain in my early 20s, into my 30s, and
17 now in my 40s, going into my 50s and I'm still fighting for
18 this mountain. I'm fighting for our way of life, our water,
19 and our mountain. So, there you have that.

20 FERC: All right.

21 MS. SOUTH: Good deal?

22 FERC: Thank you.

23 MR. SOUTH: Thank you guys. I really do hope
24 you all take it into consideration because I know, you know,
25 water is our main thing. It really is and we're blessed.

PS3B2-54

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

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 God has blessed us and we need to protect what we have.
2 Good deals, my daddy would say. I do hope you listened. I
3 really do.

4 FERC: We did.

5 MS. COLE: My name is Patricia Ann Cole.
6 Everybody calls me Cookie, That's what I've been known by
7 since I was three years old. I'm from Monroe County, West
8 Virginia. I live at Blue Roman Farm, four miles south of
9 Union on Route 219. You want my address? My address is RFD
10 1 Box 46, Union, West Virginia. 24983.

11 I'm actually located in the alternate route of
12 this 42 inch Mountain Valley Pipeline Limited Liability

PS3B2-55

13 Company situation that threatens the county. I have sacred
14 Indian burial grounds on my farm -- you don't want to know
15 about that now though, do you? I've got everything there is

PS3B2-56

16 precious and it's sacred and it's holy ground and it's Karst
17 ground and I have springs that come up out from under the
18 ground on top of the water into Blackwater Pond -- you don't
19 find those everywhere, you know? And I'm located right
20 beside Betty Farmer's Sulfur Spring Resort that actually has
21 only this other second iodine spring known in the world.

22 It's right next door to me. So that's something. I don't
23 even know if anybody realizes it, but now you all do. Did
24 you need to ask me?

25 FERC: You're good.

PS3B2-55

If the commentor is located on an alternative route that was not selected the commentor would not be affected by the MVP. Likewise, no archaeological surveys would have been conducted for the property.

PS3B2-56

The Red Sulphur Spring Resort is about 2.3 miles away from the pipeline.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 MS. COLE: I've farmed all my life. I've lived
2 down there on that farm for 44 years, but the reason I'm
3 here today talking to you all is that we need to protect our
4 lands. We're only stewards of the lands here. The Mountain
5 Valley Pipeline would be a total desecration, it would be
6 total devastation, it would be total mayhem and talk about
7 terror on earth for the people that live in America? The
8 way I personally feel is you might as well say you're going
9 to turn ISIS loose on us, because once you stuck a 42 inch
10 gas pipeline in the ground too -- that's another thing you
11 can think about what a threat that would be -- which I would
12 worry about every minute anyway -- about blowing up and
13 everything, considering how much inertia would be going
14 through it, how thin the walls of the pipe are, and also we
15 live on the St. Clair fault line that can and will show it's
16 force and it slips and slides and then devastatingly a gas
17 pipeline could explode because it is only man made.
18 Anything man made can go wrong.

19 Well, God made them springs in the waters that
20 flow through the veins on Peters Mountain the most precious
21 water in the world. It's won the International Water
22 Tasting Contest 7 years in a row. It's the best water we
23 could ever have, and you know 97 MS. of the water is salt
24 water in the world now, so people better be taking care of
25 our water. Take care of our people. Take care of our land

PS3B2-57

PS3B2-57

See the response to comment IND2-1 regarding safety. Faults are discussed in section 4.1 of the EIS. The DOT regulations determine class pipeline thickness as described in section 4.12 of the EIS.

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

1 and our way of life. Let us try to live in a halfway
2 wholesome atmosphere without the pollutions of what all is
3 floating in the air and everything else.

4 It's the terrorist of all of us. It's what we
5 could stand to lose. We can not even take the chance of
6 losing our water because no water, no life. And without the
7 water we have no trees, without the trees we have no bees.
8 Without the bees, what else do we have? There was not much
9 left for us to see except we can't allow this Mountain
10 Valley Pipeline to come through anywhere, it's devastating;

PS3B2-58

11 we need to go more towards solar, wind, and water power and
12 get off of the industrial greedy trail of everybody who just
13 wants money in their pockets when it's not about money.

14 It's about life, it's about people in their
15 life, and their soul, and their sacred places and the place
16 they lay down at night and rest and don't worry about
17 something exploding or their families vaporizing around
18 them. We live during a time with so much mayhem we need to
19 leave our mountains alone.

20 We have people come here to relax and come to
21 the safety of the mountain for their mind and their good
22 state of mind without pills or any other type of drugs.
23 They come here just to be near Mother Nature, Mother Earth
24 because she gives us everything we need so we've got to quit
25 taking from her and be a steward of the land and preserve

PS3B2-58

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

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

20161116-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/16/2016

90

1 her.

2 Save our water. You know the EPA needs to
3 stand up for -- Environmental Protection Agency, well let me
4 tell you, they need to start protecting the environment,
5 instead of sitting up there in that new building with their
6 little sconces on the wall with that frogs and blue herons
7 made out of metal; that's all that's going to be left one
8 day because they've done polluted everything else; so you
9 need to be thinking about that.

10 So what I got to say is my name is Cookie Cole
11 and I stand with Standing Rock also and you can see my
12 Indian brothers out yonder fighting this other oil line, but
13 the thing is it's not about all these, let's get the oil to
14 market, because you can't drink oil and you can't drink gas.
15 You're not, you can't go out and make fresh pure spring
16 water. So people need to think about that when they lay
17 down at night and wonder, do they have a good clean glass of
18 water to drink in case they get thirsty during the night.
19 Or have they ever had a good thirst in their heart, maybe
20 they should feel it and go out in the hot desert and try to
21 have some of that.

22 Really, there's so much I need to say, I
23 haven't even thought, the vertebrates, every living
24 creature, animal, every living thing on earth. It's sacred,
25 it's holy, we must protect it. Dear God and this is not the

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

PS3B2-59

1 way to do it with this destruction. It's just mayhem. It
2 will just be mayhem, it will be like raping through virgin
3 ground, and dear God, only God has eminent domain. I worked
4 all my life to pay off banks so I could live there and thank
5 God to protect my land to have somebody come and say, "Oh,
6 we can throw eminent domain on you." Well, let me tell you
7 what, I will stand and fight until they run over me with the
8 dozer before they come through there and do the eminent
9 domain thing.

10 I just don't know what else to tell you all
11 except that I've been praying hard and deep because the good
12 Lord sends me here. That's why I'm here today. It's the
13 same reason I went and testified in front of Congress back
14 in the 90's when we fought the 765 power line they was
15 wanting to run across the mountain that could also desecrate
16 and ruin our waters, so.

17 FERC: Conclude.

18 MS. COLE: That's how I'll conclude with, only
19 God has eminent domain. And also, the moon still shines on
20 Peters Mountain.

21 Y'all got me carried away, see.

22 (Thereupon, at 8 p.m., the public verbal comment session
23 concluded.)

24
25

PS3B2-59

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

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS3B – Peterstown Elementary School, Peterstown, WV– Room 2 – November 3, 2016

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: Peterstown, West 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 Daniel Hawkins
25 Official Reporter

PUBLIC COMMENT SESSIONS

PS4A – California Area High School Coal Center, PA– Room 1 – November 9, 2016

20161109-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/09/2016

3

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: Coal Center, Pennsylvania

16 Date: November 9, 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

PS4A – California Area High School Coal Center, PA– Room 2 – November 9, 2016

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: Coal Center, Pennsylvania

16 Date: November 9, 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 Mike Williams

25 Official Reporter

APPENDIX AA-1

**Forest Service-Related Public Comments Received
from December 23-26, 2016**

This page intentionally left blank

**Mountain Valley Pipeline Project
Environmental Impact Statement**

*Response to
Forest Service-Related Public Comments Received
from December 23-26, 2016*

May 12, 2017

Prepared by

United States Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
George Washington Jefferson National Forest
Roanoke, Virginia

BACKGROUND

History

On October 23, 2015, Mountain Valley filed its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pursuant to the Natural Gas Act. Mountain Valley is seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity from the Commission authorizing the proposed Mountain Valley Project (MVP), with facilities located in the State of West Virginia and the Commonwealth of Virginia. The MVP would involve constructing and operating about 303.5 miles of 42-inch-diameter pipeline; 3 compressor stations; and numerous associated facilities. Of the approximately 304 miles of pipeline, approximately 3.5 miles cross national forest system lands in the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests in Monroe County, West Virginia, and Giles and Montgomery Counties in Virginia.

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, the FERC is the Lead Federal Agency for producing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to analyze and disclose the impacts associated with the proposed project. The Forest Service (FS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and US Army Corps of Engineers are cooperating agencies in the development of the EIS. The FERC will consider issuing a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. The BLM, under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, will consider a Right-of-Way Grant (ROW) application for the pipeline to cross Federal lands, and the FS is considering amendments to their Land and Resource Management Plan.

On September 16, 2016, the FERC issued a Notice of Availability (NOA) of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The NOA initiated a 90-day public comment period that ended on December 22, 2016. On October 14, 2016 BLM and FS issued an agency-specific NOA announcing the opening of the FERC comment period and clarifying that the full 90-day public comment period required by the FS would end on 90 days following the publication date of the FERC's NOA in the Federal Register. Therefore, the FS is responsible for responding to comments received during the full 90-day period, which ended December 26, 2016. While this did not represent a formal extension of FERC's comment period, FERC accepted and accessioned comments received between December 23 and 26, 2016 and forwarded them to FS and BLM for review and response. This report details the FS disposition of those comments and is a companion to FERC's Response to DEIS Comments Report.

METHODOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION OF COMMENTS

The FERC encouraged interested parties to submit substantive comments and provided responses in their response to comment document. For comments received during FERC's comment period, comments identified by FERC as specific to the BLM and FS were forwarded to those agencies, which provided responses to FERC. The FS responses are included along with FERC's responses for letters received from October 14, 2016 through

December 22, 2016 in FERC's Comment Response Report, to which this report is an appendix.

Comments received from December 23 through December 26, 2017 were accessioned by FERC and forwarded to the BLM and FS for coding, review, and response to substantive comments. According to the BLM guidance (Handbook H-1790-1), substantive comments address one or more of the following:

- the accuracy of information in the EIS;
- the adequacy of, methodology for, or assumptions used for the environmental analysis;
- new information relevant to the analysis;
- reasonable alternatives addition to those analyzed in the EIS; and/or
- changes or revisions in one or more of the alternatives.

Comments that are not considered substantive include the following:

- comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives without reasoning that meet the criteria listed above;
- comments that only agree or disagree with BLM policy or resource decisions without justification or supporting data that meet the criteria listed above;
- comments that don't pertain to the project area or the project;
- comments that take the form of vague, open-ended questions.

FERC received eight comment submissions during the period from December 23 to 26, 2016, each of which is appended to this report. FS and BLM staff and their third-party contractor (Galileo Project, LLC) read all of the submissions. Using the guidelines discussed above, the agencies determined which comments were substantive. All submissions were entered into a database that included individual comments, the submission's author and address, and corresponding key word(s).

The agencies followed CEQ regulations found at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1503.4 and developed responses and/or provided recommendations to FERC for revisions to the draft EIS in response to substantive comments. During this process, the comments were sorted by resource topic or issue to aid the in identifying trends and see the full range of public opinion regarding particular topics. Reviewing comments in this manner facilitated the development of comprehensive responses.

The Comment and Response Table (below) is similarly organized by topic. Each comment has an identifying code to allow tracking of the comments and responses in a database with each respondent and each piece of correspondence. Please note that some comments may have been consolidated or edited for grammar and clarity.

Responses to individually coded comments are provided in the far right column of the Comment and Response table below. Some responses refer to comments and responses already provided in FERC's Comment Response Report, to which this report is an appendix.

The BLM and FS appreciate the time and effort the public put into their comments.

COMMENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FS	U.S. National Forest Service
GCSZ	Giles County Seismic Zone
MVP	Mountain Valley Project
NF	National Forest
NFS	National Forest System
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOA	Federal Register Notice of Availability
POD	Plan of Development
Project	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project
Rx	Management Prescription
ROW	right-of-way

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
Land Use, Visual Resources, and Recreation Comments				
20161223-5068 (31859796)	FS01	FS1-1	The Jefferson National Forest is one such space. The Forest Management Plan for the Jefferson National Forest outlines standards for management and land use within the forest. There are environmental protections in the Jefferson National Forest Management Plan that would prohibit the Mountain Valley Pipeline from being built on that land. I am aware of a number of amendments that have been proposed to evade these restrictions. The Forest Management Plan exists to protect the Jefferson National Forest from irreparable harm, and irreparable harm would be caused by the Mountain Valley Pipeline project. I strongly oppose these amendments, as they would weaken protections that have served to protect these delicate habitats, paving the way for other projects that would also cause damage to this area in the future.	See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
20161223-5084 (31860285)	FS02	FS02-4	I oppose the amendments proposed to the Jefferson National Forest and its Forest Management Plan. The amendments will weaken existing protections on public land so that the Mountain valley Pipeline can be built. The Forest Service has the legal power and responsibility to tell FERC that the MVP cannot go through the National Forest. The Forest management Plan should be upheld and not amended to sacrifice the health of the Jefferson National Forest.	See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1.
20161223-5087 (31859798)	FS03	FS03-1	The Proposed "Amendments" to the Management Plan for the Jefferson National Forest will degrade the ecosystem integrity, sustainability, and biodiversity of the Jefferson National Forest, and thereby diminish the multitude of environmental services (particularly intact forest and associated erosion protection, clean water, clean air, and economically critical outdoor recreation opportunities) that the National Forest currently provides.	See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
20161223-5087 (31859798)	FS03	FS03-4	There is National cultural attachment to the Appalachian Trail. It has "high public value" in the words of Appalachian Trail Club members. The impacts from amendment 4 would be far-reaching, even worldwide-- not "restricted to the project area" as claimed in the DEIS. I believe the proposed idea to "mitigate" through horizontal boring under the Trail was rejected by MVP's own geologists as inappropriate, not recommended, or inadvisable.	See the response to comment FA10-1.
20161223-5104 (31860280)	FS05	FS05-1	I strongly oppose the application for a Special Use Permit to cross the Jefferson National Forest and the requests for amendments to the Forest Plan. I would urge the BLM and Forest Service to reject the application.	See the response to comments FA8-1 and FA10-1.
20161223-5104 (31860280)	FS05	FS05-2	I personally find the DEIS to be wholly inadequate. As I understand the law, the applicant is required to show that there is no reasonable alternative to crossing Forest Service land or the application has to be denied. The application merely states that the proposed route is preferable. The pipeline would skirt both the Peters Mountain and Brush Mountain East Wilderness areas, and would severely impact the wilderness experience - in the construction phase and scars from construction could mar some of the views permanently.	Section 3.0 Alternatives discusses alternatives that avoid crossing the Jefferson National Forest.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
20161223-5104 (31860280)	FS05	FS05-5	The pipeline is proposed to cross about 1 mile of the Brush Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area, thus destroying the wilderness value of this area. Roads built in the area will inevitably lead to degraded water quality. Roads invariably damage forests by degrading water quality, and promoting the invasion of non-native species and eliminating forest habitat.	The crossings of Craig Creek and the Brush Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area have been intensely studied by Mountain Valley and the FS because of the concerns expressed in this comment. The effects are discussed in the EIS, Section 3.5.3.1, Brush Mountain Minor Route Variations. Mountain Valley has committed to restoring the riparian area along the tributary to Craig Creek with hand planted trees and shrubs.
20161227-0009 (31860184)	FS06	FS06-1	FERC also proposes to re-zone part of the Jefferson National Forest to create a 500-foot wide "Utility Corridor" for future gas, electricity and water lines. That's over one and a half football fields in width. And if it has to be that wide through the national Forest, how wide will it be as it runs through the countryside and towns? I think that's this is a terrible swath of destruction to run through a National Forest and believe we don't even need these pipelines!	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-Land Use on Federal Lands, FEIS Amendment, Part 1 for further discussion.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
National Environmental Policy Act Process Comments				
20161223-5098 (31859027)	FS04	FS04-1	I am writing to comment on the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposal, with specific reference to Proposed Amendment 1 to the Jefferson National Forest Plan. In a related letter submitted to FERC on 22 December 2016, I advanced a number of reasons why Proposed Amendment No. 1 (the 500-foot designated utility corridor) should not be implemented and should be rejected. Among those reasons: Mountain Valley Pipeline's routing decision were poorly performed. For the BLM and FS to allow those decisions to dictate the location for a 500-foot designated utility corridor, without conducting an independent analysis and competent review of alternatives, would be unfortunate and poorly advised.	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-Land Use on Federal Lands, FEIS Amendment, Part 1 for further discussion.
20161223-5098 (31859027)	FS04	FS04-3	Proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Jefferson National Forest Plan should be rejected.	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-Land Use on Federal Lands, FEIS Amendment, Part 1 for further discussion.
20161223-5098 (31859027)	FS04	FS04-4	Mountain Valley Pipeline's request for an easement through Jefferson National Forest should be rejected.	The comment is noted.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
20161227-5018 (31859074)	FS07	FS07-1	As an affected landowner of the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline and a US citizen and taxpayer, I am deeply disturbed at the suggestion of a 500 foot “utility corridor” through National Forest Service land as outlined in the recent amendments to its Land Use Management Plan. This amendment is contrary to the public interest in many ways: it spoils NFS lands, encourages further over-development of this type on NFS lands, further exposes private landowners along this proposed corridor to additional takings by eminent domain, discourages in-state use of the gas being transported, and ignores the question of whether these pipelines are actually needed.	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-Land Use on Federal Lands, FEIS Amendment, Part 1 for further discussion.
20161227-5018 (31859074)	FS07	FS07-2	Firstly, if the proposed corridor goes through road less areas, this is a further violation of the 2001 Roadless Rule and sets a very dangerous precedent for future projects of this type. The 2001 Roadless Rule establishes prohibitions on road construction, road reconstruction, and timber harvesting on 58.5 million acres of inventoried roadless areas on National Forest System lands. The intent of the 2001 Roadless Rule is to provide lasting protection for inventoried road less areas within the National Forest System in the context of multiple-use management.	See response to comment C0114-34.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016				
Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
Comments Addressing Multiple Resources				
20161223-5087 (31859798)	FS03	FS03-3	Okay, so what happens when the dried out vegetation and duff burns off the top three feet? And what happens if the soil has eroded away on steep, un-vegetated slopes, leaving the pipeline "uninsulated"? What if heavy equipment is needed to fight fire? I can come up with plenty more scenarios, but if you try, you can. too. Just THINK, dear Forest Service. Please don't blow it.	See Section 4.8.2.6 Land Use on Federal Lands for discussion of fire suppression on NFS lands.
Geology Comments				
20161223-5068 (31859796)	FS01	FS1-2	The Jefferson National Forest Management plan has explicit provisions regarding steep slope erosion control. Karst hydrology and erosion control are critical for ensuring the safety of surrounding communities, both in terms of immediate threats such as sinkholes and landslides, and delayed threats such as compromising water quality. Even if the construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline project ensures adherence to FERC's best practices, it is not adequate to prevent dangerous situations given the wet, mountainous land that the pipeline would be built through.	Section 4.1 Geology addresses the risks of high landslide potentials, highly erodible soils, and very steep slopes. For NFS lands, the applicable mitigation measures designed to minimize the potential for soil movement and to ensure adequate restoration and revegetation are identified in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan [Plan of Development (POD), Appendix C], Landslide Mitigation Plan (POD, Appendix F), the Site Specific Design of Stabilization Measures in High Hazard Portions of the Route (POD, Appendix G), the Restoration Plan (POD, Appendix H), and the Winter Construction Plan (POD, Appendix L). Mountain Valley would also follow the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
20161223-5098 (31859027)	FS04	FS04-2	<p>The MVP would cross the Jefferson National Forest within the GCSZ. The GCSZ is a seismically active area known for small local seismic events and one historic quake that took place in 1897 before modern seismic monitoring equipment but was estimated to be magnitude 5.8 ...”</p> <p>The GCSZ acronym in the above text refers to the Giles County Seismic Zone, an area of enhanced seismic that remains active.¹ Why is a 42-inch diameter high-pressure natural gas pipeline being routed through this terrain? The process used for routing of the Mountain Valley Pipeline through the mountains of Appalachia was seriously flawed.²</p>	<p>Section 4.1 Geology addresses the risks of high landslide potentials, highly erodible soils, and very steep slopes, The applicable mitigation measures designed to minimize the potential for soil movement and to ensure adequate restoration and revegetation are identified in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (POD, Appendix C), Landslide Mitigation Plan (POD, Appendix F), the Site Specific Design of Stabilization Measures in High Hazard Portions of the Route (POD, Appendix G), the Restoration Plan (POD, Appendix H), and the Winter Construction Plan (POD, Appendix L). Mountain Valley would also follow the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan.</p>

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016

Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
Soils and Sediments Comments				
20161223-5087 (31859798)	FS03	FS03-2	The DEIS also states that "Dry and Xeric Oak Forest" and "Dry and Dry-Mesic Oak-Pine Forest are considered well-represented". That is, they admit dry areas exist. Stripping tall, old shading vegetation off will worsen evaporation and make the soils permanently dry, and thus, incapable of supporting the more shallow rooted vegetation they claim will hold the soil in place on slopes. Believe me, no amount of Hydroseed and little swaths of black plastic fence can fix this.	Mountain Valley would follow the Restoration Plan (POD, Appendix H), the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan. The FS has worked with Mountain Valley to identify seed mixes appropriate for this area, revegetation procedures and mitigation measures, such as reducing the permanent operational right-of-way that is converted to herbaceous cover from 50' wide to 10' wide for its length on the Jefferson National Forest. Along the edge of this linear corridor a variety of FS approved shrubs, small trees and shallow rooted trees should be planted and maintained along a slightly undulating line in order to break up the straight edge and offer a variety of plant heights to reduce a hard shadow line. Reducing the herbaceous right-of-way width and allowing more of a vegetative transition within the operational corridor (i.e., grasses over the pipeline then shrubs between the grasses and treeline) would not only help mitigate the effects of the change to the scenic character of the area but increase soil stabilization as well.

RESPONSE TO DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS DATED DECEMBER 23 to 26, 2016				
Accession #	ID	Sub-ID	Public Comment	Response/Reference to FERC response
Comments Pertaining to FERC				
20161223-5068 (31859796)	FS01	FS1-5	I hope you will consider these concerns surrounding my opposition to the irreparable harm that would be caused by the Mountain Valley Pipeline project. It would damage protected land in Jefferson National Forest, the local economy through compromising tourism and jobs in the region, and would pose a long lasting threat to the area regarding erosion.	The comment is noted.

Attachment A
Comment Letters

To whom it may concern,

My name is Hannah Winter and I am a citizen of the state of Virginia. I have had the opportunity to travel to many other states in the US, in addition to a number of other countries and I must say that Virginia is one of the most beautiful places I have ever been. As an avid hiker I have spent countless days and nights on the Appalachian Trail. As an employee of Rackspace (working remotely from my home in Richmond, VA from Rackspace's Blacksburg, VA office) I know for a fact that a large draw to the area (for both companies and employees) is the numerous outdoor recreational spaces that Virginia has to offer.

FS01-
1
Non-
Sub;
Land
Use/
Visual
/Rec

The Jefferson National Forest is one such space. The Forest Management Plan for the Jefferson National Forest outlines standards for management and land use within the forest. There are environmental protections in the Jefferson National Forest Management Plan that would prohibit the Mountain Valley Pipeline from being built on that land. I am aware of a number of amendments that have been proposed to evade these restrictions. The Forest Management Plan exists to protect the Jefferson National Forest from irreparable harm, and irreparable harm would be caused by the Mountain Valley Pipeline project. I strongly oppose these amendments, as they would weaken protections that have served to protect these delicate habitats, paving the way for other projects that would also cause damage to this area in the future.

FS01-
2
Non-
Sub;
Geo

The Jefferson National Forest Management plan has explicit provisions regarding steep slope erosion control. Karst hydrology and erosion control are critical for ensuring the safety of surrounding communities, both in terms of immediate threats such as sinkholes and landslides, and delayed threats such as compromising water quality. Even if the construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline project ensures adherence to FERC's best practices, it is not adequate to prevent dangerous situations given the wet, mountainous land that the pipeline would be built through.

Additionally, I am aware of studies that have shown that current energy demand can be met by existing infrastructure. This is a clear indicator that we do not need to jeopardize this region for the Mountain Valley Pipeline project.

FS01-3;
sub;
FERC

Climate change is another major issue that should be considered here. Addressing and evaluating the cumulative impacts of a project like this is a required part of the NEPA process.

FS01-4;
non-
sub;
FERC

Lastly, the pipeline would head straight through Newport, Va., an historic town in the region. Threats to historic places are not mitigable.

FS01-5;
non-
sub;
FERC

I hope you will consider these concerns surrounding my opposition to the irreparable harm that would be caused by the Mountain Valley Pipeline project. It would damage protected land in Jefferson National Forest, the local economy through compromising tourism and jobs in the region, and would pose a long lasting threat to the area regarding erosion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Hannah Winter

Document Content(s)

FERC_filing.DOCX.....1-2

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Secretary Bose,

As a citizen I am submitting comment on the DEIS for the Mountain Valley pipeline, Docket CP16-10-000.

The FERC DEIS for the Mountain Valley Pipeline fails to recognize many irreparable threats to the environmental security of Virginians and without proper research and assessment breaches numerous federal regulatory requirements that protect citizens and our environmental rights.

FS02-1;
sub;
FERC

1. NEPA process requires that FERC must complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that thoroughly investigates all environmental impacts the Mountain Valley Pipeline would cause and fully assess the need for the project that includes reasonable alternatives to the project. I demand that such an assessment be conducted to the legitimacy of the NEPA process.

FERC's current Draft Environmental Impact Statement grossly dismisses the irreparable harm the MVP would cause and in doing so directly compromises the health of all Virginians and the long term security of our environmental rights.

-The DEIS does not address the immediate or long term threat this pipeline proposes to our water security.

-The DEIS does not fully assess the damage to water quality the pipeline would create. The pipeline would cross more than 1,000 waterways and wetlands.

-The DEIS completely dismisses the "upstream" damage that the pipeline could trigger via expanded fracking and gas infrastructure, given the 2 billion cubic feet per day of added capacity the project would create.

FS02-2;
sub;
FERC

2. The draft EIS doesn't mention cumulative impacts such as climate change. The EPA recommends that FERC addresses cumulative impacts such as climate change. Addressing the cumulative impacts of life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions the pipeline would trigger is a required part of the NEPA process.

FS02-3;
sub;
FERC

3. FERC must assess the need for the pipeline in a thorough environmental impact statement. Studies show that current energy demand can be met by existing infrastructure. We don't even need the Mountain Valley pipeline. If the need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline is not properly assessed, FERC will be violating the NEPA process and our environmental rights.

FS02-4
Non-Sub;
Land Use/
Visual/Rec

4. I oppose the amendments proposed to the Jefferson National Forest and its Forest Management Plan. The amendments will weaken existing protections on public land so that the Mountain valley Pipeline can be built. The Forest Service has the legal power and responsibility to tell FERC that the MVP cannot go through the National Forest. The Forest management Plan should be upheld and not amended to sacrifice the health of the Jefferson National Forest.

FS02-5
Sub;
FERC

In solidarity with many others, I urge you to deny Mountain Valley Pipeline's application or, at minimum, conduct a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement that assesses all the regional pipeline projects in one document.

Best,

Izzy Pezzulo

Document Content(s)

FERC_Comment_dec22.DOCX.....1-2

RE: Objections to crossing of U.S. Forest Service Lands by Mountain Valley Pipeline
Docket CP16-10-000

Dear FERC and Forest Service Folks,

I strongly object to and oppose the Proposed Amendments to the Land Resource Management Plan for the Jefferson National Forest, as stated in the NOA of the DEIS and in the MVP DEIS itself.

WHAT are you thinking?!? This is the NATIONAL FOREST, for God's sake! The Forest Service's motto is "Caring for the Land and Serving People", not "Raping the Land and Serving Corporations". I fear you have lost sight of this, or become blinded to your duty by money. This is wrong.

In DEIS section 4.8.1.6, The Forest Service's states its mission is "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of current and future generations." That means thinking 50, 100, 150 years ahead. Imagine the Americans of 2067, who will certainly be using solar, wind and other renewable energy sources, laughing (or, more likely, crying) about a rash, irresponsible decision, made by the Forest Service in 2017, to allow a gas corporation to destroy the Nation's forests and grasslands (and mountain people's lives and culture) for a quick "fast food" profit that yielded a few decades of gas, a useless fuel in the future. The reason we have the beautiful National Forest we have today is because those who lived decades before us had the sense, respect, and foresight to protect it. Please don't let that wisdom end with you.

In DEIS section 4.8.1.6, the FS says it carries out this mission by, among other things, "the **protection** and management of NFS lands." and "It is the responsibility of the FS to manage National Forests for multiple uses of resources such as water, forage, wildlife, wood, recreation and Wilderness". Nowhere do I see mentioned management for the purpose of enriching gas corporations. Did I miss something? Maybe you did.

The Proposed "Amendments" to the Management Plan for the Jefferson National Forest will degrade the ecosystem integrity, sustainability, and biodiversity of the Jefferson National Forest, and thereby diminish the multitude of environmental services (particularly intact forest and associated erosion protection, clean water, clean air, and economically critical outdoor recreation opportunities) that the National Forest currently provides.

I find the use of the word "amendment" improper--these changes are NOT betterments or improvements to the existing plan, but rather gaping loopholes slashed in the fabric of a management plan meant to protect and properly manage FS lands... slashed by frack gas corporations who literally could NOT care less about the National Forest.

In DEIS section 4.2.8.6, the authors clearly admit the project's "linear nature" and "the topography of the Forest" make it **unsuitable for the terrain**. The DEIS also states here that

FS03-
1;
Non-
Sub;
Land
Use/
Visual/
Rec

"With these amendments the MVP would then be a conforming use of the Forest Plan"

Translation: "We know we are breaking all the rules, but if we change the rules, then we're no longer breaking them". This is not only quite insane, it is immoral. I suggest that the FS follow its Option 2, described section 4.2.8.6: "When a project would not be consistent with the Forest Plan where the project would occur the FS has the following options: "(2) reject the proposal."

Amendment 1 would create a 500-foot "Designated Utility Corridor" that could be used to locate gas, electricity or water transmission lines in the future. That is the equivalent of building a 42-lane superhighway through the National Forest. Are you nuts?! **This pristine corner of West Virginia would become the target zone for other massive pipeline projects!** It is clear that Monroe County and our region is being set up as a "Mega-Gas Pipeline sacrifice zone".

Establishing a required, designated zone for gas, electric, water, and who-knows-what-else pipelines is akin to calling in hungry cows to be fed---here they come! Get out of the way! the DEIS section 4.8.2.6 states "The primary effect of designating a new utility corridor would be the potential for **future development** within that corridor". To permit a Utility Corridor here would be like laying out the welcome mat for the multitude of additional pipeline projects now being planned--four, I understand, at last count....oh, no, wait...here comes another one---make that five more. And don't forget all the jolly little bits of above ground infrastructure that go with them: more compressor stations, access roads, shut offs, etc. You're talking about allowing this to happen in an area which should never have even ONE pipeline, period.

Geologic hazards exist which make this karst area "a no-build zone" (see the Kastning Report). How does it make sense to put all your eggs in one basket-- and on **top** of a seismic area, no less? Co-location of this magnitude creates vast potential for terrorist attacks and subsequent fire destruction. Peters Mountain supplies water to farmers, landowners, towns and municipalities... and you want to rip a corridor the width of nearly two football fields over it? What are residents supposed to drink? Dirt? Gas? Or maybe the purpose of including "water pipelines" in the utility corridor scenario is to TAKE our water--we have plenty of it and it is award-winningly good. But no thanks, we don't want you to take all our water. We need it to live. Get the picture? Do you hear me now?

Amendment 2 would grant waivers from current National Forest standards on soil conditions and riparian corridors. Let me just state here that getting lazy with the rules is a prescription for (literal, in this case) disaster. If any "amendment" were needed on this rule, it should be that it be made MORE strict, not less. The DEIS section 4.8.2.6 , which discusses proposed Amendment 2 is overlarded with nearly unintelligible gobbledegook . I request a translator, at MVP's expense. In the mean time, I believe the essence of what is being said here is "We want to run our pipeline through valuable, sensitive, **irreparable soils and waterways**, so we'll just keep saying 'we'll fix it' (using words like "mitigation measures" and "monitoring activities") until it is fully incomprehensible and our smokescreen is good and thick." They admit over and over that the "linear nature" of MVP is inappropriate for this mountain terrain. Why not save the futile effort to "make it back the way it was" and NOT do it in the first place?

Amendment 3 would allow logging of old growth forest habitat currently maintained in a special forest management prescription. In DEIS section 4.8.2.6, it is plainly stated that "Construction of the MVP would result in a **long term impact.**" and "**a long-term loss of timber**". We are not just talking about conventional wood products here. We are talking about trees which are old and can never be replaced. As such, each single one has value beyond "timber". If and when current challenges to forest health such as the Emerald Ash Borer, wipe out nearly the entire species (much like the Chestnut Blight killed all the Chestnuts, or Dutch Elm Disease killed most American Elms), imagine that within the old growth forest, there were trees able to resist these pests and create offspring capable of doing so. Or perhaps old trees can yield medicines like old trees in the Amazon Rainforest. Yes, every old growth tree is valuable-- beyond your knowing.

The DEIS also states that "Dry and Xeric Oak Forest" and "Dry and Dry-Mesic Oak-Pine Forest are considered well-represented". That is, they admit dry areas exist. Stripping tall, old shading vegetation off will worsen evaporation and make the soils permanently dry, and thus, incapable of supporting the more shallow rooted vegetation they claim will hold the soil in place on slopes. Believe me, no amount of Hydroseed and little swaths of black plastic fence can fix this.

FS03-2;
Non-
Sub;
Soils

Off the subject of amendments, for a moment-- but while we're talking about trees and dry soil, let's talk **fire**. DEIS sec 4.8.2.6 says " The presence of a pipeline would not increase fire hazards." and that surface fires wouldn't directly threaten a pipeline "because of the insulating effects of soil cover over the pipeline". Okay, so what happens when the dried out vegetation and duff burns off the top three feet? And what happens if the soil has eroded away on steep, unvegetated slopes, leaving the pipeline "uninsulated"? What if heavy equipment is needed to fight fire? I can come up with plenty more scenarios, but if you try, you can, too. Just THINK, dear Forest Service. Please don't blow it.

FS03-3;
Sub;
Multi

Amendment 4 would authorize a destructive crossing of the historic Appalachian Scenic Trail, permanently changing the scenic quality from High to Moderate. This matters to the **Nation**. Not just us little hillbillies in Monroe County. **The United States**. Now you are messing with the Big Dog. Don't take that lightly.

The AT matters to the thousands who hike all or part of the Trail. These folks are not "visual receptors" (a term used in DEIS section 5.1.8). They are human beings who crave to be in a wild, pristine place. They require it for mental and physical health, sanity, and growth. There is **National** cultural attachment to the AT. It has "high public value" in the words of ATC members. The impacts from amendment 4 would be far-reaching, even worldwide-- not "restricted to the project area" as claimed in the DEIS. I believe the proposed idea to "mitigate" through horizontal boring under the Trail was rejected by MVP's **own** geologists as inappropriate, not recommended, or inadvisable. You should ask them about that. I could go on and on here about the Appalachian Trail, but I have already submitted a comment specifically about it in an earlier eFiling. So, to summarize: I beg you not to allow this desecration.

FS03-4;
Sub;
Land
Use/
Visual/
Rec

The MVP should not be allowed to cross Forest Service Lands along Peters Mountain.

The proposed amendments to the FS LRMP are not acceptable.

The U.S. Forests belong to the American public: EVERYONE.. We are all affected by these decisions. I pray that God guides you to make the right decision for us all.

Sincerely,

Beth Covington and Michael T. Martin

PO Box 57, Greenville, WV 24945

(304)832-6078 covington925@hotmail.com

Document Content(s)

MVP DEIS Comment FS FERC.DOCX.....1-4

23 December 2016

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

Victoria Craft and Miriam Liberatore,
US Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
vcraft@blm.gov
mliberat@blm.gov

Jennifer Adams
US Forest Service (USFS)
Jefferson National Forest
comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson@fs.fed.us
jenniferpadams@fs.fed.us

RE: FERC Docket CP 16-10
Mountain Valley Pipeline proposal
Proposed Amendment No. 1 to Jefferson National Forest Plan

Dear Ms. Bose, Members of the Commission, Ms. Adams, Ms. Craft, and Ms. Liberatore,

I am writing to comment on the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposal, with specific reference to Proposed Amendment 1 to the Jefferson National Forest Plan. In a related letter submitted to FERC on 22 December 2016, I advanced a number of reasons why Proposed Amendment No. 1 (the 500-foot designated utility corridor) should not be implemented and should be rejected. Among those reasons: Mountain Valley Pipeline's routing decision were poorly performed. For the BLM and USFS to allow those decisions to dictate the location for a 500-foot designated utility corridor, without conducting an independent analysis and competent review of alternatives, would be unfortunate and poorly advised.

In support of that logic, I will copy text from the DEIS section 4.1.1.7 Jefferson National Forest:

"Landslides are a dominant geologic process shaping Peters Mountain, Sinking Creek Mountain, and Brush Mountain. Debris flows are the dominant landslide process in the Appalachian Mountains in Virginia ... Specific studies on debris flows within National Forests have shown that debris flows were initiated along fill slopes and not only by natural slope failures. Most studies of debris flows in Virginia have focused on debris flows in general or debris flows initiated by natural slope failures ...

The largest known landslides in eastern North America are on the south flank of Sinking Creek Mountain ... where the pipeline route would cross the Jefferson National Forest ... The pipeline route on Sinking Creek Mountain (MPs 217.2 to 217.6) crosses one of the large bedrock landslides mapped by Schultz (1993).

FS04-1;
sub;
Process

FS04-2;
Sub;
GEO

The MVP would cross the Jefferson National Forest within the GCSZ. The GCSZ is a seismically active area known for small local seismic events and one historic quake that took place in 1897 before modern before modern seismic monitoring equipment but was estimated to be magnitude 5.8 ...”

The GCSZ acronym in the above text refers to the Giles County Seismic Zone, an area of enhanced seismic that remains active.¹

Why is a 42-inch diameter high-pressure natural gas pipeline being routed through this terrain? The process used for routing of the Mountain Valley Pipeline through the mountains of Appalachia was seriously flawed.²

FS04-3;
non-sub;
NEPA

Proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Jefferson National Forest Plan should be rejected.

Mountain Valley Pipeline’s request for an easement through Jefferson National Forest should be rejected.

FS04-4;
non-sub;
NEPA

Mountain Valley Pipeline’s application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity should be rejected.

With regards,



Carl E. Zipper, Blacksburg Virginia 24060

¹ Biryol, C.B.; Wagner, L.S.; Fischer, K.M.; and Hawman, R.B., 2016, Relationship between observed upper mantle structures and recent tectonic activity across the Southeastern United States: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 121, 21p. (DOI: 10.1002/2015JB012698).

² See submittal 20151125-5156 to FERC Docket CP16-10, Motion to Protest and Intervene.

Document Content(s)

Debris Slides Letter.PDF.....1-2

Harlan K Sandberg, Pompano Beach, FL.

To Whom it may concern:

FS05-1;
Sub;
Land
Use/Rec/
Visual

-I strongly oppose the application for a Special Use Permit to cross the Jefferson National Forest and the requests for amendments to the Forest Plan.

I would urge the BLM and Forest Service to reject the application.

I personally find the draft EIS to be wholly inadequate. As I understand the law, the applicant is required to show that there is no reasonable alternative to crossing Forest Service land or the application has to be denied. The application merely states that the proposed route is preferable. The pipeline would skirt both the Peters Mountain and Brush Mountain East Wilderness areas, and would severely impact the wilderness experience - in the construction phase and scars from construction could mar some of the views permanently.

FS05-2;
Sub;
Land
Use/Rec/
Visual

The DEIS makes no attempt to assess the impacts of this proposed pipeline on the Appalachian Trail in context with other pipelines and projects that would damage the AT's character and value. This failure violates FERC's duty to perform an adequate cumulative impacts analysis under NEPA.

FS05-3;
Sub;
Land/Vis

The potential damage to waterways, particularly impacts on headwater streams, is inadequately addressed.

FS05-4;
Sub;
Water

The pipeline is proposed to cross about 1 mile of the Brush Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area, thus destroying the wilderness value of this area. Roads built in the area will inevitably lead to degraded water quality, Roads invariably damage forests by degrading water quality, and promoting the invasion of non-native species and eliminating forest habitat.

FS05-5;
non-sub;
land-use/
Visual/
Rec

For these reasons I urge the rejection of the application for a special use permit allowing the building of the Mountain Valley Pipeline. I appreciate the opportunity to make my views known.

Harlan K Sandberg

Document Content(s)

51559.TXT.....1-1

Non-Decisional Items

Major Concerns

Caleb Laieski <c.laieski@yahoo.com>

Fri 12/23/2016 1:20 PM

To: OEA Customer <Customer@ferc.gov>;

cc: FERC Online Support <FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov>; Anton Porter <Anton.Porter@ferc.gov>; jill.dobbin@ferc.gov <jill.dobbin@ferc.gov>; Jamie Simler <Jamie.Simler@ferc.gov>; Norman Bay <Norman.Bay@ferc.gov>; Cheryl LaFleur <Cheryl.LaFleur@ferc.gov>; Andrew Holleman <Andrew.Holleman@ferc.gov>; Colette D. Honorable <Colette.Honorable@ferc.gov>; William Sauer <William.Sauer@ferc.gov>; ttidwell@fs.fed.us <ttidwell@fs.fed.us>; djiron@fs.fed.us <djiron@fs.fed.us>; acoleman@fs.fed.us <acoleman@fs.fed.us>; tcbaily@fs.fed.us <tcbaily@fs.fed.us>; Ward, Molly (GOV) <molly.ward@governor.virginia.gov>; natural.resources@governor.virginia.gov <natural.resources@governor.virginia.gov>; Suzette.Denslow@governor.virginia.gov <Suzette.Denslow@governor.virginia.gov>; Terry.McAuliffe@governor.virginia.gov <Terry.McAuliffe@governor.virginia.gov>; Terence.McAuliffe@governor.virginia.gov <Terence.McAuliffe@governor.virginia.gov>; Joseph.D.Garcia@wv.gov <Joseph.D.Garcia@wv.gov>; Charlie.O.Lorensen@wv.gov <Charlie.O.Lorensen@wv.gov>; Patricia.A.Burdette@wv.gov <Patricia.A.Burdette@wv.gov>; Rebecca.L.Neal@wv.gov <Rebecca.L.Neal@wv.gov>; Susan.A.Fox@wv.gov <Susan.A.Fox@wv.gov>; Paylor, David (DEQ) <David.Paylor@deq.virginia.gov>; Randy.C.Huffman@Wv.gov <Randy.C.Huffman@Wv.gov>;

Importance: High

FSO
6-1;
Sub;
Lan
d
Use/
Vis/
Rec

I am writing as a Virginian that is concerned about the climate change impacts of methane releases from leaking pipelines. The pipeline is also planned to pass through the Jefferson National Forest. The U.S. Forest Service has publicly said that given the terrain, the pipeline could not be built in compliance with the current Forest Management Plan. FERC's response? Reduce standards in the management plan, allow removal of currently preserved old-growth forest, and allow the pipeline to cross the Appalachian National Scenic Trail with measurable harm to scenic integrity. I am certainly opposed to this! FERC also proposes to re-zone part of the Jefferson National Forest to create a 500-foot wide "Utility Corridor" for future gas, electricity and water lines. That's over one and a half football fields in width. And if it has to be that wide through the national Forest, how wide will it be as it runs through the countryside and towns? I think that's this is a terrible swath of destruction to run through a National Forest and believe we don't even need these pipelines! Studies show that current energy demand can be met by existing infrastructure. Furthermore, the gas isn't intended to the communities that will be harmed. The pipeline's environmental destruction and dangers to health won't benefit Virginians and aren't even needed.

Reference: The Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) project is a proposed natural gas pipeline system that would span approximately 300 miles from northwestern West Virginia to southern Virginia. **FERC Docket # CP16-10-000**

Thank you very much for your time and consideration,

Caleb Laieski
109 Timberidge Drive
Fredericksburg, VA 22406

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
FERC

2016 DEC 23 PM 1:25

Division of Energy
Department of Energy

Document Content(s)

14452172.tif.....1-2

Vicki Pierson, Walkersville, WV.

FS07-1;
Sub;
NEPA/
Process

As an affected landowner of the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline and a US citizen and taxpayer, I am deeply disturbed at the suggestion of a 500 foot "utility corridor" through National Forest Service land as outlined in the recent amendments to its Land Use Management Plan. This amendment is contrary to the public interest in many ways: it spoils NFS lands, encourages further overdevelopment of this type on NFS lands, further exposes private landowners along this proposed corridor to additional takings by eminent domain, discourages in-state use of the gas being transported, and ignores the question of whether these pipelines are actually needed.

FS07-2;
Non-Sub;
NEPA/
Process

Firstly, if the proposed corridor goes through roadless areas, this is a further violation of the 2001 Roadless Rule and sets a very dangerous precedent for future projects of this type. The 2001 Roadless Rule establishes prohibitions on road construction, road reconstruction, and timber harvesting on 58.5 million acres of inventoried roadless areas on National Forest System lands. The intent of the 2001 Roadless Rule is to provide lasting protection for inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System in the context of multiple-use management. A 500 foot "utility corridor" seriously disrupts wildlife migration routes and mars the natural appearance of NFS lands.

Additionally, establishment of such a corridor creates an incentive for the future co-location of additional projects, thus making it more likely that private landowners along the present route will be subject to further takings by eminent domain. Very few private landowners have the acreage or financial resources to withstand repeated assaults on their private property rights. It is incumbent on FERC to safeguard the private property rights of US citizens.

Third, these multiple pipeline projects propose to take natural gas away from the areas where it is produced, thus discouraging local industrial development that is so vitally needed in these economically struggling areas.

Lastly, in their proposals, the developers of these natural gas pipeline projects assert that subscription rates for pipeline capacity demonstrate the need for additional natural gas in the target region, but they fail to compare the region's existing natural gas supply capacity to its expected future peak demand for natural gas. A recent study has evaluated these parameters and finds that, in fact, given existing pipeline capacity, existing natural gas storage, the expected reversal of the direction of flow on the existing Transco pipeline, and the expected upgrade of an existing Columbia pipeline, the supply capacity of the Virginia-Carolinas region's existing natural gas infrastructure is more than sufficient to meet expected future peak demand. This result raises significant questions about the need for additional investment in new interstate natural gas pipelines in the region. Additional interstate natural gas pipelines, like the Atlantic Coast and Mountain Valley projects, are not needed to keep the lights on, homes and businesses heated, and existing and new industrial facilities in the region in production. This demonstrates that the pipelines' primary purpose is clearly export rather than the benefit of US citizens.

FS07-3;
Sub;
FERC

In closing, I would like to point out that the proposal of a "utility corridor" implies that the pipeline companies would fall under the

FS07-4;
Sub;
Land Use/
Rec/Vis

purview of a utility and must therefore be regulated as such, including the strict limitations on profits. Indeed, if private land is being taken by a for-profit company for what they assert is a public project, the profits should accrue to the US Treasury and not to fill the coffers of a private company.

Document Content(s)

51596.TXT.....1-2

-----Original Message-----

From: bondurantlaw <bondurantlaw@aol.com>

To: vcrafft <vcrafft@blm.gov>; mliberat <mliberat@blm.gov>

Cc: amelvin3 <amelvin3@verizon.net>; jenniferpadams <jenniferpadams@fs.fed.us>; Mary_C_Krueger <Mary_C_Krueger@nps.gov>; McCurdy.alaina <McCurdy.alaina@epa.gov>; Rudnick.barbara <Rudnick.barbara@epa.gov>

Sent: Mon, Dec 26, 2016 10:33 pm

Subject: Additional public hearings and showing of "need" in REIS/PEIS

Dear Agents Craft and Liberatore,

I'm informed that as you are the Lead Project Manager and Assistant Project Managers, respectively, on the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, I should direct my request for additional public hearings and improved EIS to you. On behalf of the Bent Mountain community, I'd like to express appreciation for BLM involvement and concern in this project. We also appreciate the extension of time of four days for communications in this matter. I've copied my colleague Ann Rogers of Preserve Roanoke Bent Mountain and the Advisory Committee, as well as related contacts with the Forest Service, Park Service and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Certainly as a neighbor to the Blue Ridge Parkway, Bent Mountain has specific concerns regarding the environment, economics and aesthetics wrought by MVP's proposal; but we further share the substantive and procedural concerns of *other* communities in the throes of the MVP-FERC process. Several of our substantive concerns are set forth in Roanoke County's Comments filed with FERC on December 22nd, including the Assessment of Hydrogeologic Impacts by geologist Pamela Dodds, and the simulation views from the Blue Ridge Parkway by Hill Studios. Dr. Dodds and other experts have emphasized the connections from the watershed of the Jefferson National Forest, through karst landscapes in Montgomery County, on to the proposed crossing at Roanoke River and to a major source of regional drinking water at Spring Hollow Reservoir. That the Roanoke Logperch has been afforded protections here in other infrastructure projects speaks not just to the importance of that fish alone, but to an ecosystem worthy of our best efforts to protect it.

FS0
8-1;
Non
;Mul
ti

We've voiced our procedural concerns for some time--throughout the "open house" process, scoping, and now the DEIS public comment process. (It's worth noting that Roanoke County's request for additional "scoping" hearings was ignored. The County has also voiced questions regarding the "public" hearing process on November 3rd at the Roanoke Sheraton.) We would ask you to consider the plight of the rural elderly, among others, who are often not technology literate and often cannot not participate in an online process--MVP admits in Resource Report 5 that the rural elderly are disproportionately affected--but that the company has no mitigation duty because it will do no harm. Additional hearings would afford a public voice to the elderly and others for whom technology or distance from the November 3rd Roanoke hearing at the Sheraton Airport were a barrier to Due Process.

FS
08-
2;
No
n;
NE
PA

Noting that your agency questioned whether the applicant had presented any bona fide "public need", we appreciate your consideration of a "Revised EIS." However, we would also ask you to consider the link below and the attached brief

FS8
-3;
Sub;
NEP
A/
Proc
ess

submitted by attorneys for Preserve Craig, Inc., in support of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Marcellus shale region. The attached brief offers examples of PEIS used to *assess public need* in planning federal infrastructure-- in fact the Department of Interior, together with the Department of Energy, conducted the regional analysis for the Western Pipeline Expansion Project. FERC Commissioners have repeatedly averred that they are unable to do a PEIS, when in reality, the FERC's umbrella agency, the DOE, has conducted at least one; and several have been undertaken by federal agencies since 2004. A PEIS would assist agency planning in *this and other projects*. http://www.roanoke.com/opinion/commentary/stanton-and-wolf-natural-gas-pipelines-need-re-think-and/article_725de078-127e-5bd3-b950-d6a180b2faeb.html

Thank you for your time, expertise and commitment in considering our requests. If it would help your analysis, we would be glad to give you a driving and walking tour of the Roanoke River Crossing, the top of Poor Mountain and on to Adney Gap at the Parkway, which would cover the route through Roanoke County. Please feel free to respond by email, or call at the number below if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind Regards,

Roberta M. Bondurant
Preserve Roanoke/Bent Mountain
(540) 793-4769

Document Content(s)

BLM.Request.pdf.PDF.....1-2