

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF:	:	Project No.
MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC	:	CP16-10-000
EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT	:	CP16-13-000

- - - - - x

Sheraton-Roanoke Hotel &  
 Conference Center  
 2801 Hershberger Road  
 Roanoke, Virginia 24017

Thursday, November 3, 2016

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

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. BETTS: I'm Charles Betts. And I am from  
3 3265 Nikkel Lane in Blacksburg. I am not a long-term,  
4 deep-roots Virginian. I spent 39 years in the military and  
5 moved here 10 years ago.

6 I oppose the current plan for the pipeline for  
7 several reasons. One, the plan is quite fluid and  
8 everchanging. In the military, I wasn't quite used to that.  
9 Their routes appear not to be the best routes for the least  
10 impact. I was not pleased to see a 50-foot easement may  
11 become a 500-foot corridor through the National Forest. A  
12 500-foot corridor becomes a dam break rather than a leak in  
13 the dam.

14 And the other thing that I have some concern  
15 about is the use of the product as it comes in, natural gas.  
16 It appears to be mostly overseas sales with a very minimum  
17 amount available to southeastern United States, western  
18 Virginia and Virginia. It's kind of a cost benefit  
19 analysis, as far as I'm concerned.

20 There's a tremendous impact for this pipeline on  
21 the environment, and this is one of the most beautiful parts  
22 of our country. In particular, a 500-foot corridor would  
23 have a significant impact on wildlife, scenery and  
24 particularly on those private property owners who are  
25 deep-root property owners been here. I have got friends who

1 has properties been in their family since the late 1700s,  
2 and that's quite an impact.

3 I see it as benefiting a very few, creating a few  
4 jobs, but at a cost to me that is a little unreasonable. I  
5 don't deny that someone would make some money off of it, but  
6 I don't think the typical Virginian and the population of  
7 the southeast is gonna be benefited by it. Thank you.

8 MS. BETTS: Jacqueline Betts. I am not a  
9 landowner. So I come as a concerned citizen. I own no land  
10 affected by the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposed route  
11 through Virginia. The concerns I have are multifold.

12 First, who is benefiting from this venture? It  
13 appears that those invested in the proposed pipeline are the  
14 big winners. We're being told that the natural gas that  
15 will be transported will be sold outside of our country.

16 Second, our environment will be greatly affected  
17 and this resource which state all aspects of the region come  
18 into play from the many animal species to the physical  
19 alterations of streams, mountainsides and caves, just to  
20 name a few.

21 And thirdly, it seems that private citizens and  
22 landowners are the big losers in all of this. No longer can  
23 they feel secure in processing prized property that they are  
24 proud to own and manage.

25 In summary, I'm having a difficult time assuring

1 my children and grandchildren that [what] they may try to  
2 achieve in this great nation is safe. Distrust is becoming  
3 the norm and freedoms are being infringed upon. Thank you.

4 MR. GIVENS: My name is Clarence Givens. I  
5 object to the pipeline coming through the area of Giles  
6 County and the village of Newport. The pipeline should not  
7 go through designated historic districts. The National  
8 Historic Preservation Act--we thought--was supposed to  
9 provide some protection for historic districts, and of  
10 course, that's why the historic districts were formed.

11 There is an alternative route that this pipeline  
12 could go through, known as Hybrid Alternate 1A, that would  
13 not go through any historic districts. I believe there are  
14 eight historic districts that would be affected if this  
15 pipeline goes the way it's now planned.

16 It appears to me that the Environmental Impact  
17 Statement draft does not specify what MVP, the builder of  
18 this pipeline, would do to protect the water resources in  
19 our area. And that's very important for agriculture arming  
20 operations that are still going on in that area, and have  
21 been for a couple hundred years.

22 It's not been demonstrated to me that there's  
23 been a demonstrated need for a pipeline. Studies of  
24 pipelines that are now in existence have indicated that the  
25 pipelines in existence can handle movement of natural gas

1 without building all this brand-new infrastructure that's  
2 tearing up our environment, and is proposing to tear up the  
3 village of Newport.

4           There is a great lack of information in the  
5 Environmental Impact Statement that pertains to the eastern  
6 end of Giles County where this pipeline's gonna go. It's  
7 very -- well, it just keeps on missing. Every time MVP and  
8 their contractors put out new information, they keep on  
9 missing possible affected properties.

10           MR. LIONBERGER: My name is Samuel L. Lionberger,  
11 Jr. My address is 55 Harbor View Circle. I live in  
12 Penhook, Virginia on Smith Mountain Lake. I own my own  
13 property, but I don't think we're technically affected by  
14 the proposed gas line, but I'm been involved in economic  
15 development here in the Roanoke Valley for over 40 years,  
16 maybe over 50 years.

17           I'm a retired commercial builder, and I've also  
18 been active in economic development for most of my career.  
19 The issue of constructing a new natural gas pipeline into  
20 our depressed area has drawn a lot of interest, both pro and  
21 con. I hope my thoughts this evening will be helpful.

22           First, as you and the members of the FERC  
23 Commission know, any time there is a new road or a major  
24 development or something that changes the landscape, there  
25 are people who object when they feel it has some degree of

1 impact on their property. Concerns vary from grading and  
2 drainage issues to increased traffic, etcetera.

3           From my years of experience, I have found their  
4 objection is because they are comfortable with theirs and  
5 their surrounding properties as it exists, but they cannot  
6 envision the proposed development and its economic impact on  
7 their area. A common concern is that property values will  
8 go down. Any good appraiser will tell you that history has  
9 shown, with minor exceptions, that such development doesn't  
10 change values hardly at all when completed.

11           There is a strong and an accurate concern that we  
12 need to have more economic development in our area to create  
13 new jobs and a new tax base to support our schools and our  
14 public resources. However, when it affects their own  
15 property, people object for the mostly unfounded concerns  
16 that I stated just before.

17           Thus, it is very difficult sometimes for elected  
18 officials to create needed economic growth when such  
19 personal objections impede it. A common argument you have  
20 heard is "well, you know, we really do need that, but not  
21 across my land or next to me." Well, the same goes for this  
22 proposed natural gas pipeline. Most people who oppose such  
23 economic development projects do so primarily for personal  
24 reasons, and are not considering the significant positive  
25 benefit it will mean to both attracting new businesses, as

1 well as retaining others.

2           Yes, there will be some temporary disruption to  
3 the individual properties as the line is installed. And as  
4 you well know, there are excellent regulations enforced  
5 during the construction period that protect environmental  
6 impacts. These are of a temporary nature and when done, the  
7 areas will often be returned to very close to the way the  
8 property was prior to the project.

9           We must, as a state and a community, realize that  
10 infrastructure improvements are critical to attracting new  
11 and keeping existing businesses. You certainly would not  
12 build a new manufacturing plant if there were not water,  
13 sewer and power available. And now, the same goes for  
14 natural gas availability.

15           Successful economic development starts with an  
16 attitude of positive support for growth. If we only look at  
17 our own property and for personal or political reasons,  
18 block improvements and economic infrastructure projects such  
19 as this pipeline, we send a message that we are not  
20 receptive to new growth of business and industry to create  
21 our needed jobs. This is a true fact, and if not approved,  
22 the area will continue to decline economically.

23           I'm sure you will get comments from environmental  
24 groups opposing this project, but also know that  
25 well-designed and well-managed projects can create economic

1 growth where environmental protection can also co-exist for  
2 the mutual benefit of our communities and our population.  
3 Thank you for considering my views.

4 MR. WARD: Benjamin Harrison Ward. I am a  
5 business owner. My business is located approximately on the  
6 corner of Route 419 and Tinsley Road, Bent Mountain  
7 Agricultural Corporation and Bent Mountain Bistro. And I am  
8 one of the largest employers, if not the largest employer in  
9 the Bent Mountain area.

10 I'm here because I believe that FERC has not  
11 demonstrated a need for the pipeline, as identified in their  
12 draft Environmental Impact Statement. I feel like the taps  
13 at Webster and Roanoke are proposed taps there are nothing  
14 but window-dressing. I think that a lot of the conclusions  
15 that were reached in the draft environmental impact  
16 statement lack credibility.

17 As a business owner, I have to comply with all of  
18 Virginia's water and environmental standards. I have to  
19 meet the same water standards as a municipality serving  
20 water to the public, and as such, that involves monthly  
21 water testing. And I'm familiar with the geology in that  
22 area, and I think that based on my personal knowledge of  
23 Bent Mountain and the Bent Mountain area, I disagree  
24 strongly with the conclusions reached in that draft  
25 environmental study.



1           And I feel like the process has been somewhat  
2 undermined, I think. And I'm not very pleased with this  
3 entire process. I feel like it's kind of a subversion of  
4 our democracy, and I'm also against taking people's lands  
5 under imminent domain when I don't feel there's a clear  
6 public need. And hopefully the Commissioners will not go  
7 along with this, or the bulk of this. Thanks.

8           MR. BAILEY: I'm Douglas Michael Bailey. I do  
9 not own land. Well, first off, can I hand this to you,  
10 would that be easier? I'll hand this to you. I would like  
11 to add the attachment, which is, I would like to see the  
12 interstate, the center lane of interstates, being considered  
13 as possible sites, to eliminate imminent domain.

14           And then I have three lines of comments here. I  
15 will give them to you. Thank you very much.

16           MS. DUERK: I am Barbara Duerk. I am not a  
17 landowner. But I am a bicyclist. And I understand the  
18 economic impact of investments and bicycling facilities is  
19 substantiated by local trail investment, shared use paths,  
20 like New River Trail or rail-to-trail conversion is an  
21 economic engine in southwest Virginia. I know from using  
22 the Roanoke Valley Greenway system that multi-use trails can  
23 be located and are adjacent to gas lines, petroleum  
24 pipelines and are constructed as part of storm water  
25 projects.

1           The cost benefit ratio of adding a multi-use  
2 corridor with the construction of the pipeline can be  
3 financially feasible and will be a public relations  
4 "together we can" project. Somebody said, "well, they can't  
5 do it. They don't have the money." I'm hearing that the  
6 cost is not a barrier.

7           I think to address the water runoff and the  
8 topography, that they need to build bridges or trellises  
9 across the valleys. If they can't do that, then use  
10 cantilevers on the bridges that are already there, that they  
11 need to use existing paths instead of funding new  
12 right-of-ways.

13           And I have pictures here that show shared use  
14 utilities. This one is Verizon, the lights, electricity and  
15 telephone. This is a picture of a shared use path. It's on  
16 Mill Mountain, which is in the center of the city. It is an  
17 AEP right-of-way. It has a pipeline on it. And then this  
18 is the multi-use path that has people on it. So pipeline,  
19 electricity, all are right together.

20           This is a picture of the Tinker Creek Greenway  
21 that shows the pipeline. It shows the railroad. It shows  
22 the greenway that is a multi-use path that's shared by  
23 walkers, bicyclists and horses. And then this is the Tinker  
24 Creek Greenway which is the water. So the pipeline exists  
25 within the watershed without any problem. It's been there

1 for years and there's been no noted difficulty.

2           This 500-foot right-of-way that evidently the  
3 U.S. Forest Service is mentioning is unrealistic. It's  
4 negative. We need to add a side path, a multi-use path to  
5 make this pipeline cost benefit ratio. We've seen in Alaska  
6 where they can be run above-ground, so they don't need to  
7 interfere with the topography, and we've seen in Europe  
8 where they can be economic and landscape attractive --  
9 economic beneficial and landscape attractive.

10           MS. HAVERTY: My name is Georgia Haverty. The  
11 pipeline does cross my property at 412 Doe Creek Farm Road.

12           MR. MARSH: My name's Campbell Marsh.

13           MS. HAVERTY: My name is Georgia Haverty. My  
14 address is 412 Doe Creek Farm Road, Pembroke, Virginia. I  
15 am strongly opposed to the Mountain Valley Pipeline for  
16 several reasons. Number one, the MVP as currently proposed  
17 runs through the middle of my property, Doe Creek Farm,  
18 which is a 400-acre cattle farm, "you pick" apple orchard,  
19 dog-boarding kennel and wedding venue.

20           The Virginia Department of Historical Resources  
21 has determined that the entire farm is eligible for historic  
22 designation under agriculture and architecture period of  
23 significance 1883 to 1966. The water supply comes from one  
24 mountain spring, which has been the sole water source for  
25 the farm since the 1800s. Construction of this pipeline may

1 destroy the spring and therefore all businesses, not to  
2 mention two family homes.

3           The numbers of customers and guests near the  
4 proposed pipeline have defined Doe Creek Farm as a  
5 high-consequence area. This means entire wedding parties  
6 and families and children who take field trips to pick  
7 apples and enjoy the farm experience are now within a blast  
8 zone. If customers stop booking weddings or coming to pick  
9 apples because of the pipeline, a high consequence area  
10 won't matter, but again, businesses will be destroyed. If  
11 businesses are destroyed, my family and I will have to move.  
12 Unfortunately, property values will plummet with the  
13 pipeline installation, so moving will not be possible.  
14 These consequences are unmitigable.

15           Number two. DEIS amendments will irreparably  
16 harm the Jefferson National Forest. These include creating  
17 a 500-foot wide utility corridor, degrading the forest and  
18 viewsheds. Relaxing restrictions that protect soil and  
19 riparian conditions, cutting down currently protected  
20 old-growth forests, and permitting the MVP to cross the  
21 Appalachian National Scenic Trail while downgrading scenic  
22 integrity and restoration. These actions are unmitigable.

23           Number three. The geology and topography of this  
24 area have been studied and reported as an extremely  
25 hazardous and dangerous no-build zone for the MVP. The

1 Kastning Report on geohazards of the proposed MVP have been  
2 given to FERC. If this report continues to be ignored by  
3 the Commission, each member and all employees of FERC, who  
4 have been made aware of it, could and should be held  
5 accountable, and personally liable. Pipeline construction  
6 through this geology and topography is unmitigable.

7 Here are copies of the karst reports in three  
8 forms. I do still want to give these to you because  
9 evidently nobody's reading it.

10 MS. SCHLAUDECKER: My name is Sandra  
11 Schlaudecker. The pipeline does not cross my land.

12 MR. MARSH: Campbell Marsh.

13 MS. SCHLAUDECKER: According to the National  
14 Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, FERC must define the purpose  
15 and need for a proposed project in the DEIS. According to a  
16 recent released study, September 16th, by the  
17 Massachusetts-based Synapse Energy Economics, the ACP and  
18 MVP would financially benefit the utility companies and  
19 investors, while burdening customers with higher bills to  
20 cover the costs of the unnecessary construction.

21 An equal or greater amount of natural gas can be  
22 supplied by existing and upgraded pipelines and a lower cost  
23 with far fewer impacts. The ACP and MVP cannot be said to  
24 serve the greater public good. Existing pipelines can  
25 supply more than enough fuel to power the region through

1 2030.

2 By FERC failing to comply with NEPA's mandates,  
3 horrible impacts to national forestland and private lands  
4 will take place. Imminent domain will have to be used to  
5 obtain land that owners do not want taken. In the FERC DEIS  
6 DO272 September 16 book on Pages ES-14 under Major  
7 Conclusion, it is stated, "we determined that construction  
8 and operation of the project would result in limited adverse  
9 environmental impacts with the except of the impact on  
10 forests." On Page ES-7 under Land Use and Visual Resources,  
11 it says "the MVP pipeline route would cross mostly forests,  
12 81%," so if my math is correct, 81% of 301 miles equals 242  
13 miles. How can such a project be considered?

14 NEPA also requires agencies to consider  
15 environmental impacts of a proposed project and make that  
16 information available to the public. As a registered and  
17 rent intervenor, I receive all the FERC filings. It is  
18 almost impossible to locate a document due to the horrible  
19 way the FERC library is organized.

20 Also, since there have been significant details  
21 added since the DEIS was finished, the final comments, date  
22 of December 22nd, 2016, should be extended. It is not fair  
23 to have less than the normal 60 days to research the newest  
24 filings by MVP. It is my understanding to date the entire  
25 route has not been surveyed. Again, more time is needed.

1 Filings have shown shortfalls in MVP's data, including  
2 effects of blasting, sedimentation, private wells and septic  
3 systems, communities and landowners, steep slopes and stream  
4 crossings, to name a few.

5           It is the FERC's job to make sure all of these  
6 areas are adequately and correctly addressed and that that  
7 information is available and is searchable and in a readable  
8 manner. Many things have been asked of MVP, many things  
9 have not been answered, or poorly answered with information  
10 missing.

11           It is my understanding the FERC has said MVP can  
12 submit information prior to construction, but how can a  
13 scoping meeting such as this have public input when the  
14 information is not available?

15           Erosion is a huge concern. MVP and the FERC have  
16 assured the public that this will not be a problem, yet we  
17 have seen photos taken by drones of the catastrophic erosion  
18 that is taking place just west of Harrisburg from the gas  
19 pipe used for the Celanese Plant. How can we trust when we  
20 are being told -- when it seems we have been lied to, at  
21 least in this case?

22           The terrain the MVP will have to traverse is even  
23 steeper and much longer. Running pipeline through karst  
24 topography when a lead scientist in this field, Dr.  
25 Kastning, has said this should not be done due to caves,

1 underground streams, sinkholes and it is absolutely wrong.  
2 Some of the leases I have seen allow for anything to be  
3 transported in the pipeline.

4           It is my understanding that FERC does not  
5 regulate these, whose responsibility is to make sure that  
6 people notice. While burning natural gas results in CO2,  
7 less CO2 than burning coal, the methane that is released in  
8 the fracking process and transporting is much worse for  
9 creating the greenhouse effect and global warming.

10           MR. SHOCKLEY: My name is Jim Shockley. I live  
11 at 620 Big Spring Road, Fincastle, Virginia. It's in  
12 Botetourt County. I'm vice-president of operations for  
13 Roanoke Gas Company. I support the pipeline for several  
14 reasons. The pipeline benefits the Roanoke Valley and  
15 increases reliability because it provides Roanoke with a  
16 third source of natural gas.

17           We believe in the pipelines, the project in  
18 itself, because the pipelines are the proven safest mode of  
19 transporting fossil fuels across the nation. There've been  
20 over 16,000 miles of pipelines installed since the year  
21 2000. We also believe the project's good for the region  
22 because it will move economically beneficial Marcellus Shale  
23 gas and save our customers money, which we'll pass along to  
24 them.

25           It will also benefit the area regionally for



1 expansion purposes to allow us to serve customers that don't  
2 currently have service, with the increased capacity. And it  
3 will also bring jobs to the region, so it'll be an economic  
4 benefit for increased jobs and tax revenue.

5 MS. ECHOLS: We're Earl and Fern Echols, and  
6 we're at 362 Blue Grass Trail in Newport. And we are  
7 landowners and we was told last week -- we had surveyors to  
8 come and surveyed and I met with a young man in the street,  
9 and I said with all of this going on out here and this  
10 pipeline 65 feet from my living quarters, I don't know if I  
11 can tolerate y'all or not.

12 And he said, "Well, if this passes, we'll have to  
13 relocate you." And I said, hold it right there. I said, my  
14 husband is 80 years old in ill health. I'm 76 and try to  
15 keep things afloat, and I am not obligated to pick up and  
16 move now. And I don't think my home should be taken.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me stop you right there. No  
18 homes will be taken. The pipeline company's only authorized  
19 to negotiate an easement of land. You will never be removed  
20 from your home.

21 MS. ECHOLS: Honey, what about the 65 feet from  
22 my home? That's it. I've got an acre of lane. And that's  
23 it.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. And that's what you have  
25 to negotiate with the company is for that 65 feet

1 right-of-way.

2 MS. ECHOLS: I don't know what you're saying,  
3 "negotiating", what fashion?

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Typically--this is typically,  
5 because I don't know your case specifics--typically a  
6 pipeline will send out a land agent who will negotiate the  
7 purchase of an easement on your land. They will pay you for  
8 the easement. In no case do I ever recall anyone, and I've  
9 worked for the FERC for 25 years, never in 25 years am I  
10 aware of people being moved from their homes, or their homes  
11 being taken. That has never happened --

12 MS. ECHOLS: Well, why did he tell me --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: I do not know. He told you  
14 something that's not true.

15 MS. ECHOLS: I'm glad he caught me in a good  
16 frame of mind that day. Because I might not've been --  
17 honey, we've been in our home since '69.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: We are not moving you from your  
19 home. The company is not authorized to move you from your  
20 home. In 25 years of working for this agency, I've never  
21 seen that happen.

22 MS. ECHOLS: If you put that pipe up beside my  
23 house, and it's 65 feet, the center of the pipeline is 65 --  
24 will I still live there with it?

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: There are thousands, or hundreds

1 of thousands or millions of people do. There are millions  
2 of miles of pipeline in the United States, some are very  
3 close to residents and people live in those houses.

4 MS. ECHOLS: Well, will we stay there while  
5 they're tearing up there?

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Of course.

7 MR. ECHOLS: I'm not going anywhere.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Did I help you there?

9 MS. ECHOLS: You helped me, but I hope it made me  
10 feel better, because -- but I am worried about that  
11 pipeline, but what's to be will be. I told that young man  
12 --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Like I said, millions of miles of  
14 pipeline in the United States. Millions of miles. Right  
15 next to houses. Nothing ever happens.

16 MS. ECHOLS: I cannot believe that he told me  
17 that and you know, my husband is a grave diabetic --

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: This is why -- I'm also diabetic  
19 -- this is why you come to these meetings so we can tell you  
20 the truth.

21 MS. ECHOLS: And my husband's levels are up every  
22 week, and I take him to his doctor. And I told him this  
23 morning, I said we're gonna have to call Dr. Bailey. Well,  
24 about 30 minutes later, Dr. Bailey called us. His sugar has  
25 been sky-high all this week, since that young man told us

1 that.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Well, hopefully it'll come  
3 down now --

4 MS. ECHOLS: I hope it does.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- but I'm reassuring you that you  
6 will not be moved from your house.

7 MS. ECHOLS: I don't know why he told me that.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know either. Thank you  
9 for your time.

10 MS. ECHOLS: Thank you.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Lynn Williams. Let me  
12 count the multitude of ways this pipeline has ruined my day.  
13 Five years ago, my home caught on fire and to experience it  
14 again, I have no desire. Lightning struck much too closely  
15 nearby and I saw my home burn in the blink of an eye. This  
16 pipeline will traverse mountains and caves, all natural  
17 beauty that to us the Lord gave. Our soils slip along our  
18 less-than-stable slopes, and Lord, no earthquakes are  
19 imminent, we hope.

20 For Giles County has been a Virginia quake center  
21 until Louisa County surged ahead as the winner. This  
22 pipeline will split my lovely community in two, pushing  
23 friends from homes not knowing what to do. About all this,  
24 there is no doubt, we plan to sue over the injustice done to  
25 us right out of the blue. There is no moral right to

1 utilize imminent domain when it is for nothing more than  
2 private gain.

3 I'm proud to say Newport is a unique little town  
4 and we will fight to keep it from being brought down. Of  
5 Virginia's seven covered bridges, we have three. They are  
6 an ultra-important part of our history. "So what?", you  
7 federal officials may scoff and say, "They're not in the  
8 pipeline's direct pathway." However, they are all in the  
9 blast where evacuations are. They're Newport's identity  
10 wherever we may run.

11 And about my land, the officials don't  
12 understand. No amount of money will alter my stand. The  
13 land, like Newport, will always be a part of me. It's  
14 strong fibers of fabric within my family's history.

15 My great-great-grandparents built the Methodist  
16 church, which the pipeline's route will endanger and  
17 besmirch. And the greatest concern is our water from wells  
18 and springs. The karst makes our streams so lovely, they  
19 almost sing.

20 I am Lynn who was worried about water and fire.  
21 My family faced ruins in Newport with a fire. 'Twas on  
22 April Fool's Day in the year 1902, my family and others were  
23 quite blue.

24 For fire had reduced the family home to ash.  
25 From the blaze which it sparked in a flash. Much of Newport

1 was devastated, but we were determined and dedicated.

2           The house was slowly rebuilt since their hope  
3 could not be killed. My ancestor returned from the  
4 Revolution, had bought the land for his housing solution.

5           He stepped up to the plate, in defense of his  
6 property and state. He would want me to make a stand, to  
7 protect our beloved family land.

8           The house survived the Civil War when Yanks  
9 entered the town's door. I am Price Family Generation  
10 Number Seven, to own the land, my little piece of heaven.

11           So with that heritage, I can do less, to fight  
12 our most unwelcome guest. About our property and land, we  
13 know best, and our government leaders have failed the test.

14           In September we celebrated the Constitution. Our  
15 forefathers would be aghast at this solution. For our  
16 property is being seized for private gain by our government  
17 through eminent domain.

18           The pipeline threatens our water and land and for  
19 each, we must take a stand. The MVP is an ill wind that  
20 blows no good, and our no has not been understood.

21           From this day, let our voices be heard. The MVP  
22 is an idea quite absurd. Let the hills and mountains hear  
23 our cry. With eminent domain, I'd rather die.

24           MR. HOFFMAN: Name is Tom Hoffman. I am not a  
25 landowner where the pipeline will cross. The first thing I

1 want to say is, this is germane to this election and so  
2 forth, but when I go in that voting booth on Tuesday, I'll  
3 be thinking only about one thing and one thing only. And  
4 that's the environment. That's all. I don't care about  
5 anything else.

6           And there's a way out of this madness you know,  
7 because there's something called Alternative 1A, which would  
8 avoid a lot of the problems that's associated with this  
9 pipeline, like the karst and the Appalachian Trail and a  
10 number of other things here.

11           Why make it hard for yourself? It's gonna cost a  
12 lot more to build like this than it is to build like that.  
13 It gotta cost ten times as much. Why make it hard? And the  
14 ratepayers are gonna be the ones that pay it, they're not.  
15 And there is actually excess pipeline capacity in this state  
16 as it is. They don't need any more pipelines, they can use  
17 the ones they've got.

18           And forget about the jobs issue, because there  
19 isn't any jobs issue. Pipelines are built by specialized  
20 workers, like, welders. They're not your body shop down the  
21 street. They're specialized workers who go from one  
22 pipeline to another to another to another. And most of 'em  
23 don't live here and the pipeline when it's finished is gonna  
24 be controlled and monitored by computers in Pittsburgh, and  
25 that's not gonna create any jobs in Virginia either. I mean

1 you know --

2           And in Giles County, they wanna build it on top  
3 of all these caves and underground water and all that kind  
4 of stuff -- what do you think happens, you know, if there's  
5 some sort of disturbance. And it could cave in, and that's  
6 another thing. If the pipeline, that big 42" pipeline were  
7 to blow up, it would destroy everything in an 1,100 foot  
8 radius. 1,100 feet that way and 1,100 feet -- and that's  
9 almost as bad as a suitcase nuke, without the radiation of  
10 course. And that's just ridiculous.

11           You would ruin Giles County. Giles County gets a  
12 lot of income from tourism. They go up to the Cascades and  
13 they hike the Appalachian Trail and they go hunting in the  
14 national forest. Deer hunting, bear hunting. And they fish  
15 and you think anybody from down in Richmond is gonna say,  
16 "Hey, let's go up to Giles County and see their brand-new  
17 shiny, new pipeline"?

18           And 125 -- you started off with 125 feet, the  
19 width of it. Then you change your rules in the middle of  
20 the game and go to 500 feet. That's two football fields  
21 almost. And it's just ridiculous. And then they put a  
22 utility corridor, so they wanna put another one and another  
23 one and another one. How much gas do you need? I mean, for  
24 crying out loud, it's all gonna be exported to India anyway.

25           MS. PRUNER: It's Carol Pruner. And [the



1 pipeline] is not going across my property. What I want for  
2 Virginia and the rest of the world is clean, renewable  
3 energy that will not fill the air with pollution. Already  
4 more children die from air pollution than any disease.

5 We do not want a pipeline built over 7,000 acres  
6 of forestland. This land is composed of sinkholes, springs  
7 and caves that make the pipeline a danger. We do not want  
8 fracking that will be encouraged by the pipeline. The  
9 pipeline will damage the land, pollute the water and air  
10 where we live. Do not force the pipeline on us so you can  
11 financially benefit.

12 MS. RADER: My name is Joel Ann Rader, 320 Blue  
13 Grass Trail, Newport, Virginia. The pipeline is going right  
14 at the edge of our property. We've lived in the village of  
15 Newport our entire life. We grew up there, we were married  
16 in the Newport Mt. Olivet United Methodist Church, which is  
17 a historic building that is being ignored by MVP that's  
18 across our house.

19 We've watched many changes happen in this  
20 village. This is the most appalling significant one to us,  
21 what is happening right in front of us with the pipeline. I  
22 ask myself every day if this is America, because I don't  
23 think it was possible for money-grubbing land-stealing  
24 individuals to show up and take what is not rightfully  
25 theirs.

1           This pipeline is for personal gain, not for  
2 public use. We will not benefit from the pipeline at all.  
3 There have been many various routes of this proposed  
4 pipeline, but the present one is 221 feet from my property  
5 line. We live in a home built in 1909 with great historic  
6 value meaning to us. Yet the home has been left off of all  
7 of the charts and not listed in any of MVP's documents.  
8 Conveniently they've listed our neighbors' house across from  
9 us, but we're not on the map.

10           Probably because it should be protected by  
11 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of  
12 1966. Our home is listed with the National Register of  
13 Historic Places within the Newport Historic District. We  
14 have not had the first notification mailed to us concerning  
15 any information to attend meetings and voice our opposition.  
16 This'll be the first for us.

17           I called to request a copy of the DEIS report  
18 myself. Our name is listed in that document one time for a  
19 denial of consulting status. It's hard to argue that DEIS  
20 because the information in it is so full of erroneous facts.  
21 One example they stated is the route is following the route  
22 of the existing powerline. We live a mile from the existing  
23 powerline.

24           We're greatly concerned about the construction of  
25 the pipeline and what it will do to our property at home.

1 There are underground springs and water all around our  
2 house. Many of us and the surveyors and environmental  
3 specialists could not figure out where all the waterflows  
4 come from, so they have yet to ask permission to come on our  
5 property.

6 Also of great concern is the fact that Dr. Ernst  
7 Kastning, a karst expert, has called this route through the  
8 entire Giles County a "no deal" zone and his report, which  
9 is on file with FERC, seems to be ignored. We request that  
10 FERC recommend the alternate route, Hybrid 1A. The  
11 alternate route crosses a corridor already -- that's less  
12 landowners, less miles of national forest, and does not  
13 violate any historic districts. We invite FERC to come to  
14 Newport and actually see where this pipeline is crossing and  
15 what it's gonna do to our village.

16 MR. WOLF: My name is Bill Wolf. I am here on  
17 behalf of Preserve Craig, Inc., a non-profit environmental  
18 organization based in Newcastle, Virginia. I am here to  
19 state that, having closely read the draft Environmental  
20 Impact Statement, I strongly request that the document be  
21 withdrawn and redrafted.

22 I am requesting that because it is the opinion,  
23 not only of myself, but numerous science experts and others,  
24 that it does not comply with the National Environmental  
25 Protection Act or the Council on Environmental Quality

1 Guidelines for producing environmental impact statements.

2 That's point number one.

3 Point number two is that it does not address  
4 alternatives, or numerous issues that were submitted by  
5 professionals who spent thousands of hours looking closely  
6 at the data and provided accurate information about numerous  
7 environmental historic district and cultural resource  
8 issues, that were not adequately addressed or considered in  
9 the DEIS. The primary source of information was inaccurate  
10 and incomplete information provided by the applicant  
11 Mountain Valley Pipeline.

12 Regarding the alternates, one of the alternates  
13 that was originally considered actually avoids all primary  
14 karst territories, all forest service land, and most  
15 historic districts. And it's not even mentioned in the  
16 DEIS, or even commented on as to why it was dropped, other  
17 than internally an appear --

18 [band playing in background] I kind of object to  
19 the room and the background noise, and the fact that there's  
20 music in the background.

21 MR FRIEDMAN: I have no idea. Let's stop for a  
22 second. So we do apologize -- that's something the hotel --

23 MR. WOLF: I understand. Okay, so I was  
24 concerned because as I said, the DEIS does not comply with  
25 NEPA or CEQ guidelines and does not address numerous

1 documents that were submitted, and information -- over 23  
2 different science papers that were submitted that I'm  
3 familiar with, including papers about karst -- endangered --  
4 I've lost my train of thought from the interruption. I'm  
5 sorry.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Don't feel rushed.

7 MR. WOLF: -- information on invasive species, on  
8 sedimentation, and the special conditions of the deep, the  
9 40 to 80% slopes that are being addressed. And the fact is  
10 that these slopes are much more dangerous and much steeper  
11 than what MVP even reports in their documents.

12 So finally, the Chair of the Science Committee  
13 will be submitting additional comments at -- they're  
14 probably in an adjoining room right now -- along with a  
15 written paper on it. We will provide additional information  
16 as well. But we believe that the correct thing to do for  
17 the best interest of the public and the FERC is to withdraw  
18 this document and redraft it because it does not -- it  
19 doesn't even consider most of the public comments that were  
20 made, but rather considers and is based upon the information  
21 provided by the applicant.

22 Finally, I will comment on the new FERC process,  
23 and that is that I believe the public hearings deserve for  
24 the public to hear the public comments, and do not feel  
25 comfortable that this is a procedure that meets the

1 requirements' intentions of federal laws regarding public  
2 commenting process.

3 I do have a petition that is being circulated  
4 that I believe would be -- I'd like to turn in at this time  
5 -- specifically requesting that the DEIS be withdrawn.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Does this cover most of the points  
7 that you spoke about?

8 MR. WOLF: Some of them, yes.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: If you want to file additional  
10 written comments, because of the background noise --

11 MR. WOLF: We will do so.

12 MS. OSBORNE: My name is Suzanne Osborne. My  
13 property is not involved. My comments are that I do not  
14 feel that there's any economic benefits to our region,  
15 primarily because this is a very specialized business and  
16 most of the workers who would be involved will be transient.

17 The Department of Energy in 2015 says that we  
18 have adequate capacity with gas and with some modifications,  
19 what we have would last until 2030. Your agency, FERC,  
20 requires a "public need". If the definition of need is the  
21 number of contracts that the pipeline has in hand to warrant  
22 or to justify building it.

23 I'm also concerned about the methane from the  
24 compressor stations which are gonna take up 10 acres. This  
25 gas, methane, is much more dangerous to the environment and

1 to one's health than the carbon dioxide from coal.

2           As a financial analyst, the gas could go--almost  
3 likely will go to oversea buyers--since nothing prevents  
4 Mountain Valley Pipeline from selling this to other  
5 contractors or other distributors who then can sell to  
6 overseas. Hence, the value of this proposition to the  
7 United States and to the area, our area, is very  
8 questionable.

9           The widening of the corridor to 500 feet is very  
10 concerning to me on the environment and the impact that this  
11 will have, and whether or not there will be other pipelines  
12 laid adjacent to, or alongside, along this huge swath of  
13 land. You may remember, if you're old enough, there was an  
14 ad with an Indian with a tear in his eye, and he looked upon  
15 the landscape around him, it made him sad to see what we  
16 were doing to the sacred landscapes that we should be  
17 protecting.

18           As much as possible, we should keep the ravaging  
19 of our land from economic impact, environmental impact,  
20 especially when it's just for profits. The recent explosion  
21 of the Columbia gas pipe line, which I realize is a  
22 different kind of gas, but is an example of how horribly  
23 things could go wrong if gas, i.e., natural gas, were the  
24 only source for providing us with heat and lights, etcetera,  
25 than a pipeline might be more of a necessity. But it isn't

1 in this case. And it isn't worth taking such brave risks  
2 for the profit to investors.

3 It's almost unconscionable and I look to FERC and  
4 the Department of Energy. You're charged to protect us and  
5 our interests and the land. And I hope you should be, and  
6 will be vigilant in your responsibility to protect us and do  
7 the right thing.

8 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Mode Johnson. I am a  
9 landowner, pipeline is on my property, Milepost 223.0, plus  
10 or minus. My main points are the DEIS is not current or  
11 correct concerning the Mount Tabor Variation proposed route  
12 parcels. Also, DEIS comment deadline should be extended  
13 since new information was recently released to the public to  
14 comment on, and it should be extended whenever new  
15 information is released.

16 MVP and FERC should evaluate the DCR Slusser's  
17 Chapel Conservation Site Avoidance Concept Route. The Mount  
18 Tabor Variation proposed route should also be re-evaluated.  
19 An abandonment plan needs to be the financial responsibility  
20 of MVP and EQT or successor companies and be funded in some  
21 way in case of failure of any of the involved companies.

22 Now, back to the deadline for the DEIS to be  
23 released or extended. It was released on September 16th and  
24 it should be extended due to new information--you could call  
25 'em data dumps--of over 1,000 pages released on October 27th



1 and 248 pages on October 20th. The Mount Tabor Variation  
2 proposed route has not been completely surveyed. At least  
3 six major parcels, including two that I am a co-owner on  
4 have not been surveyed completely before it was named a  
5 proposed route after the DEIS was released and they still  
6 have not been surveyed.

7           The Mount Tabor Variation route is no better than  
8 the 2015 proposed route. Both are bad. According to the  
9 Table 3.5.1-7, an MVP submittal released on October 16th,  
10 the Mount Tabor Variation has:

11           1. More side slopes crossed, 2. More steep slope  
12 crossed, 3. More shallow rockbed crossed, 4. More forested  
13 land crossed, 5. More interior forestland crossed, 6. More  
14 forested land affected, 7. More forested land disturbed  
15 within the construction right-of-way, 8. More miles of  
16 landslide potential, 9. More forested land affected during  
17 operation, 10. More length of wetlands that was slated  
18 affected in the report, and 11. More Pony Hill streams  
19 crossed, four versus the 2015 route.

20           There's no reason the Mount Tabor Variation  
21 should be the preferred MVP route in Montgomery County. The  
22 Department of Conservation and Recreation, DCR Route, called  
23 the Slusser's Chapel Conservation Site Concept, Submittal  
24 Number 20160909-5315, should be seriously considered,  
25 surveyed and evaluated.

1           The DCR Avoidance Concept Route will avoid the  
2 sensitive karst, caves and sinkholes of the 2015 and 2016  
3 preferred routes that could be affected if a pipeline  
4 incident, can seriously contaminate well water, agricultural  
5 water, streams. The DCR concept also has fewer  
6 owner-occupied parcels.

7           There must be an EQT/MVP-funded abandonment plan  
8 for the MVP pipeline. A 42" high pressure natural gas  
9 pipeline in the ground for forty to seventy years, there is  
10 no funding for the abandonment. A metal pipe, a fossil fuel  
11 will be 100 percent fail.

12           MS. VALENZUELA: My name is Aimee Valenzuela.  
13 The land [sic] does not cross my property. I'm a Roanoke  
14 County resident. So I'm just going to go through the  
15 sections here that I've analyzed from the DEIS.

16           Section 4.9.1.6, there's only one recent study  
17 cited for the impact of gas lines on property values. Other  
18 studies range from 23 years ago. These studies are not  
19 applicable to the current situation. More analysis is  
20 needed.

21           Section 4.9.1.8 states that the pipeline will  
22 cross several communities designated as environmental  
23 justice communities due to high poverty rates.  
24 Additionally, residents over the age of 65 or over --  
25 represented across the proposed pipeline area. How these

1 populations will become economically affected was not  
2 addressed in the DEIS.

3           Furthermore, the DEIS states that the workforce,  
4 non-local workforce will result in a 21% demand in housing.  
5 This report looks at total housing units, but the  
6 availability of low-income housing units. A complete  
7 analysis needs to be done on how environmental justice  
8 communities will be affected.

9           Section 4.9.2.1 states that the effects of  
10 permanent employees is negligible and will not affect  
11 unemployment rates in the pipeline region. This is in  
12 direct opposition to posted statements to local residents.  
13 This needs to be addressed.

14           Section 4.9.2.3 states that there will be an  
15 increase in demand for police, fire and EMS services. This  
16 demand is not enumerated and could put a strain on resource  
17 constrained communities. This needs to be addressed.

18           Furthermore, that section states that a case can  
19 be made, that there will be economic benefits of employment  
20 in dollar expenditures during construction. This is in  
21 direct opposition to the statement regarding employment in  
22 4.9.2.1 and this case has not been made. The net economic  
23 benefits to the community needs to be addressed.

24           Section 4.9.2.5 states that there will be an  
25 increase to surface damage of roads used by applicants.

1 This has not been enumerated. What is the cost? And what  
2 is the economic cost to businesses along the public roads  
3 being used for construction? This needs to be addressed.

4 Section 4.9.2.6 states that the easements  
5 agreements can include indemnification language, but does  
6 not state whether this language is included. This needs  
7 clarification.

8 Additional, as stated, the pipeline right-of-way  
9 crosses known environmental justice communities. These  
10 communities cannot afford lawyers to respond to easement  
11 agreements. Construction should not move forward until this  
12 is addressed.

13 Section 4.9.2.7 states that tax revenue is over  
14 \$30 million. However, net revenue is not addressed. This  
15 analysis needs to be done.

16 Section 4.13.2 states the following impacts:  
17 Increase of growth in non-native invasive species,  
18 Habitat-enforced destruction, Emissions, yet none of the  
19 economic impact of cleanup or impact of tourism has been  
20 addressed. Construction should not move forward until this  
21 is addressed.

22 Section 4.12.2 cites a study from 1986 for safety  
23 concerns. This is not recent. From 1994 to 2013 there's  
24 been --

25 MR. MORRISON: My name is Martin Morrison. I own

1 property on an access road, which is MVP-MN-277.02. My  
2 objections are this access road was put on the Docket  
3 October 13th. I've not had the same opportunity to respond  
4 that other people have had in the same timeframe. The  
5 intervenor, I believe, was a short period early on where you  
6 could intervene and I believe that period has passed.

7           And the draft environmental study? They haven't  
8 even come down and surveyed our road yet. So how can you  
9 submit a draft study when nothing has been finalized on this  
10 property? When you drive down the gravel road, you go past  
11 the interstate maintenance sign and then you start on my  
12 land. This is a little, narrow gravel road, 12, 14 feet  
13 wide. They proposed to expand it to 40 feet wide  
14 temporarily, and then back to 25 feet.

15           I've got a mobile home where I've got a single  
16 mom and her two kids living, and then there's another older  
17 lady that lives down this road, and both of their houses are  
18 within 30 feet of the center line of this road. And it's  
19 not, they're both on the same side, but it has the road has  
20 it split between 'em.

21           I've also got a pond down there across from the  
22 older lady, and they're showing filling in part of my pond.  
23 I didn't buy this land with this pond on it for somebody to  
24 come along later and fill it in so that I can't fish, okay?  
25 I planned on building a house on this land. I did not

1 intend for a semi-public group there to be happening on this  
2 road. I believe that's my comments.

3 MS. HUMPHREY: My name is Pamela Humphrey. I'm  
4 from Newport. The pipeline does not, as it's written right  
5 now, cross my land. It did. Right now it doesn't. First,  
6 this should be very embarrassing to FERC. Are they really  
7 so afraid of us that they must speak to us in isolation? So  
8 others can't learn from the data we've been forced to  
9 collect?

10 Equitrans and Nextera obviously aren't convinced  
11 that they can build and operate this pipeline safely. If  
12 they thought they could, they wouldn't have felt it  
13 necessary to hide the liability under three--yeah,  
14 three--LLCs.

15 So who do I sue when erosion takes out the sides  
16 of my valley? Who do I sue when my spring and well fail due  
17 to diversion of the established underground channels caused  
18 by your pipeline construction? Or when my spring and my  
19 well are contaminated with silt from the erosion mentioned  
20 above? And who does my lawyer daughter sue when slope  
21 slippage or an earthquake along our documented fault line  
22 compromises the pipeline and gases release and asphyxiate me  
23 and my livestock? Or incinerate us?

24 Who do I sue when the Marcellus Shale deposit  
25 runs out in 20 years? And we're stuck with a sure to rust

1 away 42" pipe, leaving a trench across our properties and  
2 our landscape. This pipeline should not be built, but if it  
3 must be built, it should follow the route that would do the  
4 least damage to people, places and the environment.

5           We pointed out Hybrid Alternative 1A as the  
6 logical alternative to Route 200. Hybrid Alternate 1A would  
7 not go through eight historic districts. It would go  
8 through only half as much of our precious national forest.  
9 It would avoid the most extreme karst topography and it  
10 would impact significantly fewer properties.

11           We are not professionals and this isn't our job,  
12 but we managed to figure this out. If we can, why can't  
13 FERC? Their lack of due diligence is showing. My property  
14 appraisal dropped by \$18,000 because of this proposed  
15 pipeline. That's a quote. Because of this proposed  
16 pipeline. I retired here, drawn by the beauty and the  
17 abundant water, both of which FERC is willing to subvert.

18           Living with a bomb capable of blowing up  
19 everything within 1,500 feet is not acceptable to me. And  
20 having to pay taxes on the land with the bomb under it, so  
21 someone else can feed their stock profile is really over the  
22 top. FERC is supposed to be nonbiased. Start being it. Be  
23 what you're supposed to be. Examine and weigh data provided  
24 by private sources, as well as that provided by the industry  
25 hats, or we will rub your nose in your bias. Band together

1 and stop this thing on the land in the courts.

2 MR. MURPHY: My name is Brian Murphy. The  
3 current route does not cross my property. One of the  
4 previous ones did, the 110. What I wanted to simply say  
5 was, as a professional aquatic scientist, I'm extremely  
6 disappointed in the level of professionalism, completeness,  
7 analysis that is displayed in this.

8 And I'm a university professor and taught for 40  
9 years in natural resource conservation and management.  
10 Hundreds of students that I've worked with on natural  
11 resource management projects. I've taught to write  
12 scientifically. This falls so far short of any professional  
13 criteria or legitimate analysis that if I worked for FERC or  
14 MVP, I would be embarrassed for the public to look at this.

15 We sent students to work for FERC, and I've  
16 talked to them, and I've told them the same thing. To draw  
17 conclusions before all of the data are even in is  
18 unconscionable. To have analyses done by, in one case,  
19 professional engineers that were overturned by what a  
20 retired English professor found as deficiencies in the way  
21 they did their analysis on stream scour is beyond  
22 embarrassing to any professional. I can't believe that that  
23 kind of stuff makes its way through this process without  
24 being caught, either at MVP level or certainly at the FERC  
25 level, which is supposed to be providing oversight to what



1 MVP is submitting. That's it.

2 MR. WALKER: David Walker. And no, [the  
3 pipeline] doesn't cross my property, but comes in very close  
4 proximity. I'm here as a representative from Preserve Giles  
5 County and the Newport Mt. Olivet United Methodist Church.  
6 My statement is that the Kastning Report, which I have read  
7 front to back. I've read your EIS statement, although I  
8 can't say I've read all of it.

9 And from Mountain Valley Pipeline, I don't  
10 understand how you can justify putting a dangerous pipeline  
11 through the topography that is in the Giles County area,  
12 given the slope, slippage, the fact that there's an  
13 earthquake zone that runs in through there. And expect to  
14 remediate everything and have everything done properly. I'd  
15 also like to talk about the Synapse Report that states that  
16 there's no need for existing future infrastructure in order  
17 to deliver more and more fracked gas from the fields in the  
18 Marcellus area.

19 That simple reversal of flow rates can be done to  
20 achieve the same purpose and the part that upsets me the  
21 most about MVP is the lies that they've spread about, just  
22 about everything, and how they don't take into  
23 consideration, they don't even put boots on the ground, as  
24 far as the lives of the people that they're disrupting in  
25 order just to line their pockets and their corporate

1 folders.

2 I'm disappointed in FERC that they just seem to  
3 take everything as read that MVP submits to them, and they  
4 give them so many do-overs, it's ridiculous, that if  
5 something's out -- and a lot of the research and stuff that  
6 we've done and submitted, they just quote it back to you, so  
7 it's like we're doing their job, which it shouldn't have to  
8 be. And if this was a credible university or whatever and  
9 somebody was supplied the information that MVP supplied to  
10 FERC or whatever, they wouldn't be getting do-overs, they  
11 would've just had a big "F" mark slashed on their paper and  
12 handed back to 'em and told 'em to repeat the class.

13 In summation, the Newport Mt. Olivet church is a  
14 high consequence area. They have moved their area crossing  
15 Route 42 in Giles County, further towards the church, which  
16 puts it much closer than the 1,117 feet that I had measured  
17 personally, just following the road. It is much closer now  
18 to the church, and has moved further away from the school,  
19 and I can only assume they did that because there's a  
20 daycare center there and everybody loves kids.

21 So I just wanna let you know that I don't believe  
22 in the process that you all are doing. I firmly believe  
23 that you're a rubber-stamp organization, and there's not a  
24 pipeline that you guys don't believe in and put in, and the  
25 other thing that bothers me about MVP is apparently they're

1 now in business to just building pipelines. That goes the  
2 same for Atlantic Dominion and all the other ones, that they  
3 just pass on the costs of building these pipelines. They  
4 pass it on to the customers, and then if the profits tank  
5 selling the gas domestically, then --

6 MS. MALHOTRA: Lauren Malhotra.

7 MR. GITTELMAN: Samuel Gittelman.

8 MS. MALHOTRA: Great. My comment pertains to a  
9 couple of different sections of the EIS that refer to  
10 changes in the forestry, changes in the wildlife habitats.  
11 Section 4.4.2.2 states revegetation of cleared areas will be  
12 considered successful when the cover and density of  
13 vegetation within the right-of-way is similar to the  
14 adjacent land.

15 And I think that is really important to notice  
16 that it says "similar" and not the same. What it sounds  
17 like it's is promoting is, like over 10.2 acres of forest  
18 and wetland will be affected, and those regions of forest  
19 and wetland, within the right-of-way even will never return  
20 to their former state. They'll be replaced by herbaceous  
21 and shrub wetland. And even those that will begin to be  
22 revegetated, so soon as construction ends it'll take years  
23 and years for them to reach the same level of forestation  
24 that they had before.

25 And nowhere in these sections have I read that

1 the transformation of the forested land will account for the  
2 climate-caused changes that we here in Virginia are already  
3 locked into. For tree species do effectively migrate, thus  
4 for whole habitats to survive in the next few decades of  
5 warming and precipitation change. They require  
6 uninterrupted and contiguous forestland to move along. So  
7 these segmented sections of forested wetlands surrounded by  
8 areas of mere shrubs have lost a significant amount of  
9 resilience and are made more vulnerable to the effects of  
10 climate change.

11 I also wanna talk a little bit about just some  
12 far-off unintended consequences that it may have. So as  
13 property values drop because of the construction and the  
14 easements and the risk of explosions, and as folks in the  
15 community move away, which I'm sure you've already heard  
16 plenty of people talk about, feeling like they have to be  
17 forced out of their land, feeling that they have to move  
18 their families in order to remain safe and have the standard  
19 of living that they've had before.

20 So as people leave and as people have to sell  
21 their property for lower amounts than they had originally  
22 invested in, we're gonna see a lot of industry coming in to  
23 take that property and I think that the development that is  
24 gonna be caused by those falling property values and by the  
25 new -- I don't really know what that industry would

1 specifically look like, but for the most part, developments  
2 like chemical treatment plants, developments like factories  
3 or even just like Wal-Mart's, tend to have much greater  
4 environmental impacts that, say, land owners who have their  
5 house and they tend to their forested areas and maybe they  
6 have a self-sustaining garden.

7           So I think there's a lot of environmental impacts  
8 that aren't being accounted for simply because you can't  
9 predict how many people are gonna leave because of this.  
10 You can't predict how many communities are gonna be  
11 destroyed by this. And I don't know what's gonna fill that  
12 space. I don't know what's gonna fill that economic space  
13 as people's life savings are flushed down the drain because  
14 their property values are no longer even close to what they  
15 were when they first bought them. What they're gonna leave  
16 for their children.

17           MR. ALAMI: Ajmal Alami.

18           MS. DESMOND: My name's Mary Desmond.

19           MR. ALAMI: As far as I'm concerned, Equitrans  
20 and both Nextera have not factored in any negative  
21 externalities, within their proposals for this pipeline.  
22 Any of the health risks that have been included such as  
23 people receiving cancer from poison and contaminated water  
24 at the fracking site, or stress leading to short lifespans  
25 and other various illnesses.

1           There is no way to factor these in within the  
2 costs, there's no healthcare or medication factored in, as  
3 to whether these people can afford it or not once they're  
4 sickened by this pipeline. What about the loss of  
5 livelihoods for farms as well? If there is an eruption, are  
6 they going to be covered or not? Because Nextera and  
7 Equitrans, both can be held liable in a lawsuit for this?

8           There's also temporary jobs as well. The people  
9 building this are not gonna have livelihoods forever.  
10 They're gonna be used for several months and then tossed  
11 aside afterwards. And of course you go into ethical issues  
12 as well. This energy's being sold overseas at a high price.  
13 Not for Virginians, not for us. As a result, Virginians  
14 that live here are gonna lose by having imminent domain cut  
15 through their land, and they're not gonna see any of the  
16 benefits whatsoever in receiving any of this energy at all.

17           MR. DONALD JONES: My name is Donald W. Jones.

18           MR. KRZYSTON: Joseph Krzyston.

19           MR. DONALD JONES: I have some concerns for FERC  
20 dealing with the DEIS. There's been an omission on the  
21 Adlei Jones property that Mountain Valley has been made  
22 aware of, the whole farm, and also the trace road. The  
23 trace road, the other day when I was up there, it had survey  
24 markers all over it, and we feel like that trace road is a  
25 historical piece of property. We feel like it's part of the

1 Cumberland Gap Trail, and was just omitted in the DEIS.

2           Secondly, we have a mountain spring on the  
3 property that's got deeded water rights since 1881 to a farm  
4 next to us, and two other properties also have deeded water  
5 rights. This spring water is our concern -- that is they  
6 have to go in there and start blasting on this lower  
7 mountain ridge, put this, put this on the center line,  
8 putting this pipe in, that it could disrupt that spring and  
9 open up the cavities and the water will disappear.

10           Mountain Valley tells us they'll fix it. How do  
11 you fix a geological water supply that's hundreds of years  
12 old? It's never ran dry. How do you fix it? For me, it's  
13 amazing that FERC is willing to risk what we have, clean  
14 water, for the profits of a gas company.

15           And secondly, the karst terrain, which I know  
16 FERC is familiar with, but I think a lot of it's been  
17 ignored on their part. They're taking information that  
18 Mountain Valley has provided, in my opinion. I've walked  
19 the surveys with the geology surveyors and they say that  
20 they needed to do more drilling and stuff like that -- to  
21 really know before they put that pipeline in -- what's  
22 there. And they can't do that by the Code of the State of  
23 Virginia, be drilling on your property for a survey.

24           Secondly, Ernst Kastning Report kind of spells it  
25 out, and it looked like it got ignored also in the DEIS, and

1 like I say, that's concerning to me because the safety of  
2 the pipeline -- these pipelines fail. It might be 50 years  
3 from now, 75 years from now. But they fail. All of 'em do.  
4 It's a matter of when, where, where are you gonna be at when  
5 it does? Are you gonna be at the mouth of that cave that  
6 this injection of 1,400 psi gas has followed this karst  
7 terrain to this cave opening? And you peel your sweater off  
8 and the static electricity blows the whole five miles of  
9 earth up?

10           That 1,400 psi injected into the ground in this  
11 karst terrain is a dangerous situation. And I don't think  
12 the public's aware of it. I don't think anybody's thought  
13 of it.

14           MR. VIETMEIER: Rudy Vietmeier. And the pipeline  
15 is not on my property. I'm a member of the Executive  
16 Committee of the Sierra Roanoke group. I'm here today to  
17 caution you against an overreliance on the EIS on the  
18 grounds that an EIS is not what it purports to be. It is  
19 not an objective analysis of the environmental impact of a  
20 project.

21           I'm a California transplant and have been active  
22 with the Sierra Club there for a number of years. And so  
23 I've been down this road a number of times. And what I find  
24 is the system is flawed. Roanoke Plains today said the  
25 system is rigged. My criticism is a little softer than



1 that, so I'll just say it's flawed.

2           When the National Environmental Policy Act was  
3 enacted, it was probably done with the intent of issuing an  
4 objective environmental assessment, but it didn't turn out  
5 that way.

6           We're reminded of Samuel Johnson's observation:  
7 There are two things you don't wanna see made, one of them  
8 is sausage, the other is law. The flaw arises when the  
9 party opposing a project commissions a contract to carry out  
10 the environmental assessment, and the developer is obliged  
11 to shoulder the cost of the study. As such, the developer  
12 owns the study.

13           The law only requires that report be made public.  
14 It doesn't any specify any particular one. If an assessment  
15 is made and is not favorable, the developer could just  
16 commission another study until it finds one to its liking.  
17 This paves the way for the developer to choose the  
18 assessment that will be released to the public.

19           After that the necessity of issuing assessments  
20 that are amenable to projects is not lost on the contractors  
21 who want the work. So when we read an EIS, it will probably  
22 be biased toward the project. If it wasn't, you wouldn't be  
23 reading it. So I would urge caution on assessing an EIS.  
24 This concludes my comments.

25           MR. WIGGINS: My name is John Wiggins and I'm a

1 senior at Roanoke College. I understand that the job of  
2 FERC is to provide for the future of energy production in  
3 the United States. I respect that job. I, like everyone  
4 else, live in a society that consumes energy.

5           What I ask of FERC is to consider is to attempt  
6 to provide for the current energy needs using the current  
7 energy infrastructure. I strongly believe that the Mountain  
8 Valley Pipeline is not necessary to accommodate current  
9 energy consumption.

10           Another way to close the gap between energy  
11 consumption and production is to decouple the utilities.  
12 This separates energy consumption from profits. Customers  
13 will pay a consistent rate for their utilities. This will  
14 encourage utility companies to increase efficiency and  
15 reduce energy consumption. Hopefully this will decrease the  
16 need to expand the current energy infrastructure while still  
17 paying the energy companies for providing a valuable  
18 resource.

19           I hope FERC will consider using the current  
20 energy infrastructure to provide for the current and future  
21 energy needs. Also, if you have the opportunity, I would  
22 suggest the individuals of FERC to hike and explore the  
23 Appalachian Trail. The views are truly breathtaking this  
24 time of year. Thank you for your time.

25           MR. JOHNSON: My name is Bob Johnson. I live on

1 Bent Mountain. I'm an Environmental Committee and Preserve  
2 Roanoke Bent Mountain member, and an intervenor with respect  
3 to the project.

4 Today I'd like to focus on the section of the  
5 Floyd County pipeline through Roanoke County, Virginia,  
6 where traverse is poor in Bent Mountains and specifically  
7 where Bottom Creek, its headwaters and tributaries are  
8 located. The DEIS incorrectly concludes that impacts to  
9 Bottom Creek and its headwaters are short-term and can be  
10 minimized and/or avoided. It is imperative that the  
11 following facts be reconsidered and the pipeline rerouted  
12 accordingly. Many of my comments are in response to the  
13 Environmental Analysis, Section 4 of the DEIS.

14 Number one, a segment of Bottom Creek is a Tier 3  
15 stream and all of its headwater and tributaries are  
16 designated as wild, natural trout streams, populated by  
17 brook and rainbow trout. The DEIS does not indicate that.  
18 Approximately 10% of all fish species native to Virginia are  
19 found in the Bottom Creek watershed. Three rare species of  
20 fish, the big-eyed jumprock, the riverweed darter and the  
21 Roanoke darter, whose existence is well-documented in Bottom  
22 Creek. If you wanna see the Tier 3 nomination package, it's  
23 there. And they're not listed in the DEIS under known and  
24 potentially sensitive species or elsewhere in the document.

25 Tier 3 Bottom Creek, which is exceptional

1 environmental setting, exceptional recreational  
2 opportunities and exceptional aquatic communities, is the  
3 only Tier 3 water body downstream from the proposed 300-mile  
4 pipeline. It is highly sensitive to chemical and  
5 temperature pollution, turbidity and sedimentation, as are  
6 all these headwaters and tributaries.

7           According to available maps and appendices, the  
8 pipeline will cross Bottom Creek and/or its tributaries at  
9 least 39 times, and will parallel these water bodies for  
10 approximately three miles. The main body the DEIS fails to  
11 recognize this or consider the consequences.

12           Further, in light of sensitivities, waters  
13 paralleling them should be prohibited, as with the waters in  
14 Jefferson National Forest. Bottom Creek is listed as an  
15 impaired stream due to temperatures that exceeds damage to  
16 trout streams. Although the proposed pipeline is not slated  
17 to cross the impaired downstream segment, it must be assumed  
18 that the upper regions are also impaired and until the  
19 baseline data shows otherwise. No data is currently  
20 available on the headwaters.

21           Regardless, loss of stream bank cover and the  
22 permanent removal of tree canopy and native vegetation along  
23 the pipeline corridor would exacerbate the water temperature  
24 impairment of Bottom Creek and presumably its headwaters in  
25 perpetuity. This would be a violation of the

1 Anti-Degradation Policy, the Clean Water Acts, that's in  
2 316A. Further, the combination of increased water  
3 temperature, turbidity and sedimentation would disrupt trout  
4 fisheries in these waters, diminishing stream usage, which  
5 is also a violation of the Anti-Degradation Policy, the  
6 Clean Water Act, and that cannot be allowed.

7 Poor Mountain is the highest one, the steepest  
8 elevation is on the proposed pipeline corridor. Because of  
9 the shallow metamorphic bedrock extending for over four  
10 miles long in this part of the corridor, blasting will be  
11 necessary in the slopes exceeding 60%.

12 MR. TERRY: Coles Terry. Yes, [the pipeline]  
13 crosses my property. 8741 Poor Mountain Road, Bent  
14 Mountain, Virginia 24059. I don't want it. It's gonna come  
15 right through my backyard. I'm within 300 feet of it. I'm  
16 a little concerned with the wetlands it crosses, the creeks  
17 it has to cross. Just the fact that I've lived there for  
18 most of my life, my kids are the sixth generation there.

19 It's not real easy to dig through that property.  
20 They're gonna have to blast. I got well water. I'm not  
21 real sure what their plan is if something contaminates my  
22 well water, what I get to do for the rest of my life. Of  
23 course, I understand that there might not be a chance for an  
24 explosion, but if there is, I'm gone. But I heard today  
25 that on some of the older pipelines you have to worry about

1 that. So when do I have to start worrying? What do they  
2 consider old?

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: This pipeline is built to last 50  
4 years.

5 MR. TERRY: Okay. But when do they considering  
6 it too old?

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: At 50 years.

8 MR. TERRY: Great. I might make it. If I live a  
9 good life. Just worried about how it's gonna impact  
10 everything. My property, my brother's property, my  
11 sister's, where the watershed for most of Roanoke Valley,  
12 Salem area. We've got trout streams up there. There's  
13 Class Tier, that flow into a Class 3? We should be -- I  
14 think we're designated that, too.

15 They got a lot of areas to cross that are just --  
16 I don't know how they're gonna do it. It concerns me. I  
17 don't think they know how they're gonna do it. I was told  
18 today that they're gonna protect any environmentally  
19 potentially with silt vents. I've been working in  
20 construction most of my life. I know exactly how good silt  
21 vents work. I just don't like it. I don't think it's fair.  
22 And I particularly don't like being bullied, which I feel  
23 like I am being [bullied] by MVP and the surveyors and just  
24 the whole thing.

25 MS. TERRY: The pipeline crosses my property, my

1 four siblings and my 92-year-old mother. My name's Grace  
2 Terry. My three siblings, my mother and I all own parcels  
3 of land that are located within the Coles-Terry Rural  
4 Historic District, which is approved as of September 15th,  
5 2016, by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources,  
6 VDHR, as eligible for listing to the National Historic  
7 Register.

8           The Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to  
9 recognize the impacts of miles of pipeline path and multiple  
10 permanent access roads and workspaces located within the  
11 boundaries of the Coles-Terry RHD, Rural Historic District.  
12 It is stated on Page 4-345 of the DEIS that the pipeline  
13 crosses the Coles-Terry RHD; however, there is no other  
14 information given. The proposal of this RHD was identified  
15 and acknowledged by MVP in June, 2016, yet the DEIS has no  
16 evaluation of the effects. Therefore, the DEIS is  
17 inadequate in its evaluation of historic resources on Bent  
18 Mountain in Roanoke, Virginia.

19           In addition to this submission, surveyors working  
20 for the MVP entered my brother, John Coles Terry, III's,  
21 property on October 10th, 2016, without his permission and  
22 despite his attempt by certified mail to provide his phone  
23 number, to request a date to be present for surveying.

24           The surveyors dug up artifacts from the property  
25 that day and did it out of the sight of my family members,

1 including my brother's wife, who was present, and we had  
2 objected to their entry to the property, which they  
3 accomplished, not by coming up the driveway and knocking on  
4 the door of my brother's home to identify themselves and  
5 notify that they were gonna be digging holes in the back of  
6 the cleared field, which is easily accessible by a dirt road  
7 and very close visible from his house.

8           Instead, they parked multiple vehicles on Poor  
9 Mountain Road, about half a mile down on Poor Mountain Road  
10 from my brother's driveway and entered the property where  
11 they had to cross the creek, climb a steep ridge through the  
12 woods, descend through more woods and thick underbrush of an  
13 overgrown orchard to reach the ruins of an old house.

14           We have wondered, how did they know the specific  
15 location of where they were going since they were earlier --  
16 they were entering coordinates on iPads -- if they had never  
17 been on the property before? That is, how did -- if they'd  
18 never been on the property legally and with proper notice?

19           We can prove the fact that surveyors have entered  
20 our properties without permission because a neighbor videoed  
21 them and there was survey flagging in April, 2014, when they  
22 had four vehicles parked in the middle of my brother's field  
23 that is half a mile up Poor Mountain Road across a private  
24 wooden bridge and down a private gravel drive.

25           Since my brother's wife is present, we said that



1 the landowner had the right to take possession of the  
2 artifacts. The artifacts were in bags with labels, which do  
3 not have any information such as GPS coordinates on the  
4 labels that identify the location where they were dug up.

5 They tried to take our private personal property.  
6 And I would like to state my objection to FERC about this  
7 incident and have it entered in the public record and  
8 reported to VDHR and any other state and federal agency that  
9 have regulatory oversight under NEPA, Section 106.

10 MVP should be held responsible for this blatant  
11 violation of a landowner's property rights to retain  
12 possession of their artifacts. Additionally, it should be  
13 unacceptable for any entry by unidentified persons on a  
14 property, but especially problematic for surveying crews to  
15 enter a designated historic property for the disturbance and  
16 removal of artifacts, when the landowner has requested to be  
17 present.

18 MR. ADAMS: My name is Thomas Edwin Adams, III.  
19 And the pipeline does not cross my property. First of all,  
20 in looking at the Environmental Impact Statement, there are  
21 many problems with it. The biggest problems stem from just  
22 the fundamental nature of the physical setting up the  
23 proposed pipeline going across really steep terrain, where  
24 landslides are common, the threat against, proposed by the  
25 streams, crossing them, are significant because the

1 potential for flooding, and with climate change and the  
2 increased frequency and intensity of heavy rainfalls, the  
3 probability of extreme floods are increasing.

4           A clear example is what happened this past summer  
5 in West Virginia where over 30 people were killed. Very  
6 significant flooding. I just wanna state that my background  
7 is hydrometeorology, focusing on flood forecasting, which  
8 I've done for over 25 years. I'm an international  
9 consultant in flood forecasting, published a book on flood  
10 forecasting, so my credentials are pretty good.

11           There's increased frequency of landslides because  
12 of the really steep terrain and the heavy rainfall. The  
13 impact on forest resources is significant. The watershed  
14 impacts are -- from a scenic point of view -- are  
15 disastrous. The potential for spills and leakages into  
16 karst underground water pathways is incredibly significant  
17 because it is a heavily karst region, many sinkholes and  
18 subterranean conduits.

19           The impact on sedimentation in streams is highly  
20 significant. Every reason that you could think of that this  
21 is a bad location for the pipeline exists. It's an  
22 earthquake prone zone. There is an earthquake in Giles  
23 County, a magnitude over 4, in the late 1960s. So it has  
24 happened. There is obviously one in northern Virginia not  
25 long ago.

1           If those weren't enough, the impact on climate  
2 change with the increased use of carbon-based fuels should  
3 be reason enough not to do this. If anything, what we  
4 should be doing, we should be scaling back on the use of  
5 carbon-based fuels. So even going forward to do this, for  
6 those reasons should be--by itself--enough reason to not do  
7 this project.

8           We need to go to alternative sources of energy,  
9 not continue to promote the use of carbon-based fuels at  
10 this time.

11           MR. JAMES CHANDLER: James Chandler.

12           MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: Silvie Chandler.

13           MS. KATHY CHANDLER: Kathy Chandler.

14           MR. FRIEDMAN: Does the pipeline cross your  
15 property?

16           MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: It does.

17           MR. JAMES CHANDLER: The address is 10890 Green  
18 Hollow Drive, Bent Mountain.

19           MS. SILVIE CHANDLER: I feel threatened as a  
20 young girl on my property. Surveyors have come to my  
21 property several times and we have declined by overnight  
22 mail. The trespassing signs or "no pipeline" signs states  
23 that data or surveying on properties and coming on  
24 properties will be a trespass. And this comes through my  
25 yard and landowners are being taken advantage of.

1           The water will be contaminated if this pipeline  
2 leaks, and it will not only go into my water, it will  
3 contaminate half of Roanoke County. No matter what you read  
4 about people saying it will get lots of jobs and things is  
5 not adequate. It won't get any jobs. Landowners wouldn't  
6 get enough money if it did go through because there is no  
7 amount of money that will be sufficient.

8           People have been killed by pipelines and I don't  
9 wanna be one of them. And a question is that, why would  
10 obedient civilians listen to police and/or listen to police  
11 when they ask them to leave? And they don't say no. And I  
12 don't see why it's any different for surveyors to say no to  
13 police and police not do anything about it. Because police  
14 would do something about it if it was a civilian.

15           MR. BENTLEY: My name is Michael Bentley. I have  
16 undeveloped property in Roanoke County and at this time,  
17 it's not scheduled to cross my land. I have a Bachelor's  
18 degree in biology and studied geology extensively, as well  
19 as climatology in preparing for my Doctoral program, and I  
20 do have my Doctorate. I have followed this issue closely.

21           I have examined the draft Environmental Impact  
22 Statement and as a scientist myself, I'm not feeling that  
23 the draft impact statement for this project is adequate. I  
24 think that some of the analysis is flawed. To my knowledge,  
25 no 42" high-pressure natural gas pipeline has ever been

1 constructed over mountainous terrain with the karst  
2 topography such as we have in southwestern Virginia and in  
3 parts of West Virginia where this pipeline is to cross.

4 I believe that from what I have studied about  
5 this situation, the Mountain Valley Pipeline will cross in  
6 the vicinity of 1,000 streams and wetlands in Virginia and  
7 West Virginia and I don't think there's any precedent for  
8 proposing a pipeline that has such steep slopes of ascent  
9 and descent at angles ranging--from what I understand--from  
10 40 to 80%. Engineers typically limit slopes of roads and  
11 other infrastructures, such as pipelines, to less than 15%  
12 slope.

13 Constructing a corridor for Mountain Valley  
14 Pipeline at such angles is bound to result in a great deal  
15 of erosion on the mountain slopes and waterway  
16 sedimentation. As a resident of the Roanoke Valley, I fear  
17 the polluting effects of sedimentation on Carvins Cove, the  
18 City of Roanoke water reserve.

19 As a user of the Jefferson and Washington  
20 National Forests, this frequent hiker, I go to Pandapas  
21 Pond. I got to Newport. I spelunk in the caves in Newport.  
22 I am aware that all karst topography is connected as a flow  
23 way of streams. They're not individual features that are  
24 isolated. I don't think that that is adequately addressed  
25 in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. From what I

1 have read in there, they talk about avoiding this cave or  
2 that sinkhole, but without any awareness that these things  
3 are connected underground, much of which is not visible to  
4 people.

5           We have a lot of people living in rural areas. I  
6 own 18 acres of undeveloped Roanoke County land that the  
7 pipeline right now is not scheduled to cross. I fear that  
8 it might be rerouted and I want you to know that as a  
9 scientist, I am not happy with the impact statement as it's  
10 done so far, and I think it needs to be rejected, and I hope  
11 FERC opposes the construction of this pipeline in Virginia.

12           MS. KIRKBRIDE: My name is Kim Kirkbride, and the  
13 pipeline crosses within a mile of my property, but does not  
14 cross it. I just wanna note that I think that this format  
15 is incredibly un-democratic and is kind of a sham to have  
16 all these people waiting to just speak one-on-one to a  
17 recorder.

18           But what I really wanna talk about is how I  
19 think -- the impact that this would have, especially by  
20 taking the Jefferson National Forest plan and amending it to  
21 allow this pipeline to go through, which does not serve the  
22 Forest Service, the land or the communities that live there,  
23 that rely on that forest, is appalling.

24           Like I'm so surprised that you would actually go  
25 back and amend a plan that was put in place to protect this

1 place and to protect the resources that this -- like my  
2 county. I live in Giles County and we are the fastest  
3 growing recreational county in Virginia. Tourism is our  
4 industry and this is gonna cross the Appalachian Trail?

5           This is gonna be visible up to 20 miles from  
6 here? And that is going to destroy our tourism economy and  
7 I can't believe that you would actually go back and change  
8 and amend an intact forest management plan so that it would  
9 benefit a corporate project. Like that seems fundamentally  
10 un-democratic to me.

11           And I so wonder what you're thinking right now,  
12 and I wonder how you see this, and I wonder what you think  
13 about at the end of the day and how you live with watching,  
14 so far, 73 people come through here and probably most of  
15 them tell you how this will ruin their property values. It  
16 could ruin their wells. It is going to affect the economy  
17 where they live and their county because it's gonna drive  
18 tourism away. It's gonna drive new perspective landowners  
19 away. It's already wrecking the real estate market where I  
20 live. I just wanna understand. I mean I'm speaking to a  
21 recorder. But you're a human being and you are in a  
22 position -- you all are in a position to do something about  
23 this, and I don't -- I just wanna know -- I wish you would  
24 speak to me right now and let me know what it is that you  
25 think about, and whether you think that all of this is

1 totally irrelevant and you're just gonna --

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Are you done with your comments?

3 MS. KIRKBRIDE: I can be, if you'd like to speak.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's up to you. Well, you have  
5 very little time. You wanna wrap up or you wanna stop now?

6 MS. KIRKBRIDE: I think I've made myself clear.

7 MS. THOMAS: Stephanie Thomas. I'm within 0.3  
8 miles of [the pipeline]. It doesn't cross me, but it's  
9 close. I know what fossil fuel explosion feels like. I  
10 spent years recovering from burns, no fault of my own. I  
11 had eight major surgeries, two per year, and then quit, not  
12 because I didn't need more, but because I could take no  
13 more. Over 25% of my body was burned, but over 35% of my  
14 body was scarred for skin grafts.

15 My property is in the burn zone. Why our lives  
16 and quality of lives are less important than gas companies,  
17 most especially since there's no public benefit, I need  
18 someone to explain to me. Why is India, who wants  
19 renewables but cannot afford them--but we offer them fracked  
20 gas until they can get them--more important than us?

21 Why is it okay for the company to use the least  
22 safe equipment because we are considered a rural area? Why  
23 not insist the thickest pipe be used? If you lived next to  
24 it, what would you require? Please do not make us wonder  
25 every day and night of our lives, if they are over? Help us



1 move from fossil fuels to renewables.

2 I believe that before you ask someone to do  
3 something, you should experience what you are asking. Be  
4 sure to visit a burn ward close to you. Know what you are  
5 asking of others.

6 MR. RILEY: I'm Brent Riley in Roanoke County.  
7 The pipeline does not cross my property. I think what's the  
8 most important consideration here is energy policy. And how  
9 we're moving into the future with energy and what kind of  
10 people we wanna be. What kind of world we wanna have. You  
11 go to the international conferences on climate, and you have  
12 indigenous people from all over the world buying, chipping  
13 in, sending tickets up there and saying, "we've got a  
14 problem." Fossil fuel is not the solution. We need to  
15 mature and evolve beyond fossil fuel.

16 And the other point that I wanna make is what a  
17 pipeline like this of this magnitude will do to the beauty  
18 of Virginia? I think the forest service, if you ask them,  
19 they will be able to tell you that the single-most common  
20 value amongst the people in the State of Virginia is the  
21 appreciation for our ridgelines and our mountaintops, our  
22 viewsheds.

23 And so the impact of this project on our viewshed  
24 for a relatively short period time, is not a trade-off that  
25 we should be making. So rather than looking at where the

1 pipeline's gonna go or where it's at, I'm saying the whole  
2 concept needs to be rethought, and we need to mature as a  
3 society and contend with the challenges that we face.

4 MR. BOHON: My name is Cletus Bohon. And I live  
5 in the Elliston area of Montgomery County, at the foot of  
6 Poor Mountain. The pipeline does cross my property. My  
7 address is 6210 Yellow Finch Lane. My milepost is 238,  
8 approximately.

9 My main concern is my water. I don't know how  
10 you can guarantee not to mess up my water supply. And if  
11 you can, what's gonna happen to it? How will you fix it?  
12 The pipeline comes within 200 yards of my well. My well is  
13 225 foot deep. The water's at 75 feet starting, and this  
14 aquifer is connected many miles and supplies many people  
15 with drinking water.

16 I feel that the karst in this region should not  
17 be dug and blasted on. Dixie Caverns is two miles from my  
18 home. There has to be other caverns and caves in this area,  
19 but there still has been no geologic survey on or near my  
20 property that I know of.

21 They they're gonna cross the Roanoke River one  
22 mile upstream from the pump station for the Spring Hollow  
23 reservoirs, which hundreds of thousands of people rely on  
24 for their drink water. I don't know why you would let them  
25 destroy our land and our water that we worked so hard to pay

1 for and protect. And what about our children, our  
2 grandchildren? Meaning ours, yours and mine? We're gonna  
3 destroy the planet.

4 Then there's abandonment. If this pipeline does  
5 go through, there's no procedure to remove this pipeline  
6 with all the toxic sludge in there, just be left for the  
7 landowner to deal with. I think a good thing for this \$3  
8 billion being spent would be better on renewable energy. I  
9 think that's where the future is going, the wind and the  
10 solar energy. I think it would be money well-spent.

11 This country was founded by the people for the  
12 people. Not big business. I feel like there's been a loss  
13 of that. And that's sad. Please don't let this happen.

14 MR. SAVAGE: My name's Edward Savage. I'm a  
15 property owner just downstream of Milepost 218 on the  
16 proposed pipeline route along Craig Creek in Craig County.  
17 I'd like to voice my opposition to the MVP pipeline for a  
18 plethora of reasons, many of which this limited format won't  
19 allow me to fully address, including wildlife habitat,  
20 fragmentation, cultural heritage and sense-of-place issues,  
21 the impact to economic development efforts centering on  
22 quality of life and the outdoor recreation industry I have  
23 been employed in for many years. The rights of communities  
24 and states to determine their own economic future and the  
25 egregious disregard for property rights of landowners long

1 the pipeline route for a project with no proven public  
2 benefit.

3 All of those are legitimate concerns not  
4 sufficiently addressed in the draft Environmental Impact  
5 Statement, but they pale in comparison to the primacy of  
6 water. Beginning with the construction process, but  
7 certainly not limited to the sedimentation that will  
8 inevitably result from denuded slopes is unacceptable.

9 The challenges of constructing a 42" pipeline on  
10 such steep terrain and especially among karst geologic  
11 features is completely unprecedented. I rely on a spring on  
12 the side of Peters Mountain for my water, my livelihood and  
13 my very life. The threat to that invaluable resource is one  
14 that I don't take lightly. The DEIS gives no confidence  
15 that the pipeline's integrity will survive flood events,  
16 earthquakes or even increased erosion which the pipeline  
17 will inevitably cause.

18 I'm not alone in this concern as the pipeline is  
19 proposed to cross more than 1,000 streams, many of them  
20 vital first order headwater streams. In the event of a  
21 rupture, which many qualified geologists and hydrologists  
22 view as inevitability, our priceless water with which this  
23 region has been blessed, which is increasingly important in  
24 the era of a changing climate, will be forever defiled and  
25 MVP will file bankruptcy, leaving me and my neighbors to

1 clean up the mess, if we can even survive in such an  
2 environment without our most precious resource.

3 I came to this issue with an open mind. I looked  
4 for the benefits, that it might serve our community. I'm in  
5 no way radical. It's very clear that any supposed benefit  
6 of this project is far outweighed by the true cost of  
7 landowners and communities along the pipeline route, which  
8 were not addressed in the DEIS. The DEIS is severely,  
9 severely deficient. Public benefit hasn't been remotely  
10 shown to exist, let alone proven.

11 This pipeline is not necessary. Existing  
12 infrastructure would support forecasted natural gas capacity  
13 well into the future. This process, in addition, is a  
14 farce. This is not a public forum. The FERC has no  
15 accountability and an inherent conflict of interest.  
16 Although I recognize the utter impossibility of impartiality  
17 or evidence-based policy from the FERC, I implore you to  
18 please reject the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

19 MS. GRAY: My name is Nan Gray, and I'm in  
20 Newport, but no, the pipeline does not cross my property.  
21 It comes close enough that it would impact it. And I don't  
22 have any compensation coming my way. This pipeline needs to  
23 be stopped.

24 I'm going to tell you, the draft EIS is a joke.  
25 Have you started that? The draft EIS does not have a lot of

1 information. In fact, I'm reviewing the geology and the  
2 soils and the water quality and there is a whole lot of  
3 information completely missing. Never even looked up.  
4 These are water resources for Craig County, and these are  
5 the water resources we developed in 1992, stopping the  
6 American Electric Power Line that proposed to go through  
7 Craig County.

8 All the people in Craig County came together. We  
9 put our hands to our maps. These are original maps. I have  
10 more. But I brought these to show you that I actually have  
11 these maps. I photocopied them and reproduced them here,  
12 which is part of my deposition. One of the big things is  
13 Mountain Valley Pipeline has proposed to come through the  
14 Craig/Giles/Montgomery County area.

15 I went out with my GPS equipment and mapped where  
16 the sinkholes and the caves and the springs are, and then I  
17 mapped that on a piece of paper and I have a large sinkhole,  
18 which is the blue line and Mountain Valley Pipeline, which  
19 is the red line, and clearly they have a nest, a cluster of  
20 sinkholes and karst features that are not on the Mountain  
21 Valley Pipeline DEIS.

22 It should've been included. I submitted this  
23 stuff to the FERC a long time ago and it was not even  
24 considered. We produce clean water where I live. I can  
25 drink the water out of the ground. It's not polluted. I've

1 had the water tested. It's good.

2 FERC needs to have a water security zone, a  
3 national water security "no-build" zone, where nothing gets  
4 into that area to pollute the water. We all need water. We  
5 need a national food security. Mountain Valley Pipeline has  
6 proposed in its latest DEIS to destroy over 3,000 acres of  
7 prime agricultural land.

8 We don't have 3,000 spare acres in Appalachia,  
9 let alone 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land which will  
10 be impacted and destroyed forevermore. I'm a soil  
11 scientist. When you impact these soils with a construction  
12 project like this, it doesn't matter if you put some toxin  
13 in the pipes. The construction is gonna destroy your soils.  
14 It will never be the same.

15 I wanna know how many times FERC looks through a  
16 document and says, "There's a problem, there's a problem,  
17 gee, we better just not approve this route." And so what my  
18 question to you is, how many times do you have to be told  
19 "no", that there's a danger before FERC says, "Let's look at  
20 another route." Do you have an answer for me?

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll have an answer for you in the  
22 final environmental protection --.

23 MS. GRAY: Well, I think that's really  
24 short-sighted, that you're even considering coming to an  
25 area that has clean water, which is in southwest Virginia.

1 That pipeline never needs to go through West Virginia and it  
2 doesn't need to --

3 MS. BELINSKY: My name is Tammy Belinsky. The  
4 pipeline does not cross my property. It crosses within a  
5 couple miles of my home.

6 The draft EIS is woefully incomplete and  
7 inadequate to give the public information required under the  
8 National Environmental Policy Act in order for the public to  
9 comment on the impacts of the proposed action. It is  
10 inadequate for other decision makers to make adequate  
11 assessments of the impacts. There's not enough information  
12 for the Forest Service to be able to make impacts.

13 There's been a lot of information submitted to  
14 the record by individuals that show that the information  
15 provided by the developer is incomplete. They routinely  
16 leave out evidence of streams and springs and wetlands and  
17 those types of features. And that's the issue here is the  
18 impact to water, that this pipeline will cause.

19 It's an unprecedented proposal to cross these  
20 mountains with its steep terrain, its unstable geology, the  
21 soils that are present, which are very minimal, it's mostly  
22 rock. You can't backfill a pipeline with rock. Where's the  
23 soil gonna come from? What's gonna keep it staying there?  
24 It's actually just flat-out ridiculous.

25 It defies logic to try to build a 42" gas



1 pipeline over these mountains. And so what's missing from  
2 this Environmental Impact Statement is how can the impacts  
3 to water resources and soils and geology and with the karst  
4 topography, it can't be mitigated. There's evidence from  
5 Professor Kastning that this can't be mitigated. And so how  
6 can you -- and even where it can be mitigated, there's no  
7 evidence -- or mitigation is proposed, there's no evidence  
8 that mitigation can work in this geography and this geology  
9 and this terrain.

10           It's a very short-sighted proposal, because we  
11 will be sacrificing our own water security, our very own  
12 water security for a very false sense of energy security.  
13 To send energy, to send gas to Eastern Europe. To fuck with  
14 Putin. We're gonna be sacrificing our own water. This is  
15 about water. And water is life. Water is all there is.  
16 Water is all we are, and water is all we have. Water is all  
17 we have in this region, and where is my water gonna come  
18 from when I can't get it anymore because of this gas  
19 pipeline. It's ridiculous. You're a sham.

20           MR. ROBERTS: Ray Roberts. I'm from Blacksburg,  
21 Virginia. My sister has a farm in Craig that the pipeline,  
22 Route 110 and 110J crosses. So 110 and 110J have been  
23 rejected, but I also talk for Newport, the town of Newport.  
24 Newport is a historical town. It's one of the few towns in  
25 the State of Virginia that have no government bodies to

1 protect them. So there's actually no government body to  
2 protect Newport per se. There's no town council, there's no  
3 supervisory group that is coming to speak for them.

4 Newport is a very historical town. There are  
5 only seven antique covered bridges in the State of Virginia,  
6 and two of those are within a mile circle of Newport, and  
7 very close to the pipeline routing. And you probably had a  
8 chance to see the covered bridges we have. But there's two  
9 of those sites. Newport has -- There are historical  
10 structures that are 1820s.

11 I know the 1820s structures that are standing  
12 that are threatened. There's a cultural center which is an  
13 old school which is a cultural center right downtown Newport  
14 that is kind of like a center, a community center for  
15 Blacksburg and Newport, the whole group comes over there and  
16 there's like sculptures, painters -- my sister is a portrait  
17 artist. She goes in there and they sell portraits. Quilts.

18 And the pipeline is projected to go right through  
19 the middle of Newport, take out the fire station and the  
20 cultural center and then go over the next mountain towards  
21 Blacksburg. So I'm very interested in hoping that this  
22 won't happen, that you guys won't destroy the cultural  
23 center in Newport, which has a historical background. There  
24 are houses, the McWhorter's house is threatened, which is  
25 right there in front of the cultural center.

1           So Newport has a history of earthquakes. It is  
2 historically -- it's right in the middle of the karst  
3 limestone. There's caves and there's mines in the area on  
4 Brush Mountain on one side, and one of the largest  
5 landslides in the history of the Appalachians happened in  
6 Newport, so historically there was a gigantic landslide  
7 there in the past, and it's documented in history at  
8 Smithville Plantation back in the early 1800s.

9           So the chance of a landslide happening again is  
10 very possible because in the last two years, I've seen two  
11 earthquakes that shook Newport and cracked buildings. So  
12 we've actually had activity that has actually structures --  
13 and the same earthquake that actually shook and broke the  
14 Washington Monument is the same earthquake that shook  
15 Newport. I was standing there the day it happened.

16           So that is a very bad risk to run a pipeline  
17 through that earthquake-prone zone. Just very interested --  
18 there's historical Civil War sites all through the area. We  
19 have Civil War monuments on our properties and properties  
20 around Newport. There was a big Civil War battle. The  
21 stones are usually just a single stone. I've got pictures  
22 of the stones. And you can track 'em back. They say CSA on  
23 'em.

24           They're Civil War monuments and those should be  
25 protected. Native American sites are throughout the area.

1 I just wanted to say there's so much history in our area.  
2 Our area was settled in 1741, they came right through  
3 Newport, they came right through my farm. We need to go  
4 back and look at all this history and bring in the  
5 archeologist and really look at what you guys are  
6 threatening right now.

7 MR. VALENZUELA: James Valenzuela. I have the  
8 following concerns regarding the draft of the EIS. Section  
9 4.12.1 states that the minimum safety standards will be  
10 implemented. However, there have been at least two pipeline  
11 accidents since this report was released in Pennsylvania and  
12 Alabama. The MVP is within 0.1 miles of two schools. Are  
13 there new safety standards that should be implemented in  
14 light of these accidents?

15 Additionally, the economic impact of these  
16 accidents needs to be included in the report. How will the  
17 school children be impacted by construction? Traffic?  
18 Dust? Accidents, etcetera? Safety monitoring stats  
19 included in the report are: Walking the pipeline. However,  
20 there are 300 miles of pipeline across private land. How  
21 will this be done?

22 Flyovers. How often will this be done? What is  
23 the economic impact of the community and tourism areas  
24 because of this? There will be an increase in demand for  
25 police, fire and EMS services. The demand is not numerated

1 and could put strain on resource-constrained communities.  
2 Further, the applicant states that resources will be made  
3 available for these services, but that is not enumerated.

4 Section 4.12.2 states that property damage  
5 greater than \$100,000 can be reported by landowners. What  
6 about damages less than \$100,000? This threshold is  
7 insufficient to address the needs of environmental justice  
8 areas.

9 The applicants used a study from 1996 to address  
10 safety concerns. Studies from 30 years ago are not  
11 sufficient to address today's safety issues. From 1994 to  
12 2013 there have been 745 pipeline incidents causing death  
13 and injury to persons. 278 deaths, 1,059 injuries, causing  
14 \$110 million in property damage. There have been 26  
15 accidents already in 2016, including 21 injuries. The  
16 applicants have not adequately addressed their  
17 responsibility in clean-up and recovery efforts and health  
18 costs if there is an incident.

19 Additionally, the economic costs to impacted  
20 areas was not analyzed. This needs to be addressed using  
21 current studies. If none exist, then studies should be  
22 conducted by the applicant to address the issue.

23 Section 4.13.2 states the following impacts:  
24 2,902 acres of prime farmland will be disturbed. However,  
25 this is inconsistent with numbers presented in Section

1 14.8.2.1. What are the correct numbers and what is the  
2 economic impact on this loss? Emissions. What is the long  
3 term economic impact of health consequences due to increased  
4 emissions, specifically for environmental justice  
5 communities and populations greater than 65 years of age?

6 Section 5.1.3 states that the applicant would  
7 provide an alternate water source if groundwater is  
8 impacted. What would this new source be? How would it be  
9 distributed? What is the economic impact of this? What is  
10 the tourism impact? And what is the impact on environmental  
11 justice communities and populations over age 65?

12 I wish to voice a general concern about the  
13 destruction of forest on forest service lands. Development  
14 since the draft of this report that I'd like to bring to  
15 your attention. Roanoke was just voted top adventure town  
16 by Blue Ridge Outdoors. A thorough analysis of future  
17 tourism dollars versus dollar losses due to tourism needs to  
18 be conducted.

19 A recent report in Roanoke Business News showed  
20 that outdoor investments lead to better health outcomes. A  
21 thorough health and economic analysis of the gas line  
22 impacts on health needs to be conducted.

23 And finally, the MVP is in fact not needed. The  
24 estimated completion date of the pipeline is 2020, and gas  
25 production from the Marcellus extraction will be on the

1 decline at this time since it's estimated to peak in 2018.  
2 Current pipelines are operating at 54%.

3 MR. CHANDLER: James Chandler. Yes, [the  
4 pipeline does cross our property]. And we live at 10890  
5 Green Hollow Drive on Bent Mountain.

6 The mountains are our water fountains and they  
7 are imperiled. The pipeline cuts across Mill Creek on our  
8 property with a 100 acres watershed, numerous springs and  
9 wetlands on our property. Our well, our only water source,  
10 is rock-throwing distance from the pipeline pathway. Damage  
11 to the water source will--not only our water--but endanger  
12 the water supply for Roanoke County and even Roanoke city.

13 Our property's torn in half by the pipeline path,  
14 forever rendering half of it to be unusable and essentially  
15 unbuildable. Our personal enjoyment and use of the land  
16 will be forever lost to us and our children. The permanent  
17 access road for the pipeline also happens to be the only  
18 road to our driveway, knocking down a quarter mile of our  
19 pasture fencing and permanently interfering with going to  
20 work, school, church and even EMS access.

21 Your surveyor tactics during this whole process  
22 have been deceptive and threatening, coming on dates not  
23 announced. We were out of town on vacation and asked that  
24 they not come during that time, and come they did. And our  
25 due process in court to resolve the conflict has been

1 cancelled by MVP.

2 This pipeline is bad for the environment, bad for  
3 Roanoke County, bad for water quality, will destroy property  
4 values, bad for the local economy and is not needed. Please  
5 stop this before it's too late.

6 MR. REILLY: Ian Reilly. I am an affected  
7 landowner, Milepost 262 . My concerns. Use of the forest  
8 service lands as the utility corridor for this pipeline and  
9 other potential pipelines, destroying the old-growth forest,  
10 limiting recreation opportunities, disturbing wildlife, and  
11 placing the burden on the backs of the rural citizens who  
12 care about "live, lead and die" on these lands.

13 The dismissive nature of FERC officials and MVP  
14 officials, either not answering, misdirecting or  
15 disregarding the comments, research and questions raised by  
16 concerned citizens that are dealing with the threat that  
17 this pipeline, this destructive pipeline, brings with it.  
18 Personally, the disregard of MVP personnel, ignoring our  
19 biosecurity signs, endangering the lives of our livestock  
20 and my livelihood and the ability for me to provide food for  
21 my family and for other people, trespassing, and we're also  
22 transitioning to organic, and a pipeline coming through,  
23 that's a very specific environmental issue. Organic lands  
24 with pipes with all the chemicals, herbicides and whatever  
25 else is gonna be sprayed, causing issues.



1                   We have two creeks and a wetland area that would  
2 be potentially crossed by this that are very sensitive  
3 areas, banks, water for animals, as well as for recreation.  
4 And for the record, one last thing, I think that Paul  
5 Friedman's an asshole. Thank you.

6                   MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Genesis Chapman. No,  
7 [the pipeline] does not cross my property. It crosses the  
8 property of almost all my neighbors, and it crosses the  
9 property that my family's rented for their business for 25  
10 years. They also -- I think they want to use the driveway  
11 to my family's woodshop as an access road, which would  
12 really screw up with our business, to say the least.

13                   But I have lived on Bent Mountain all my life.  
14 I'm very concerned with the quality of the environmental  
15 report, the DEIS report, having known the creeks, the ridges  
16 like the back of my hands since I was a kid, and then seeing  
17 the proposed pathway, I'm shocked at the route it's taking,  
18 much less actually coming over Bent Mountain, which is a  
19 huge mountain. It's shale.

20                   I haven't seen anything that really -- it's hard  
21 to find any information about the creeks themselves. 39  
22 creeks, tributaries to Bottom Creek, which is a Tier 3,  
23 supposedly protected, creek. It filters all the water from  
24 all the wetlands on the mountain and the springs into  
25 Roanoke, into the Roanoke River.

1           And I just don't see that any of that stuff has  
2 been addressed fully or even in depth. And one of the  
3 problems that I've really had with the folks from the  
4 pipeline is I have been helping out -- been very, very  
5 inconsistent with their surveying, coming and going whenever  
6 they want to. I've helped many of my neighbors, a lot of  
7 them elderly, when surveyors show up when they said they  
8 were not going to be there, days, weeks early.

9           The inconsistencies, the disregard for people's  
10 property. A month ago, I helped get a -- they had parked  
11 and set up equipment in an elderly woman's hay pasture  
12 without asking. All these are very indicative to me that  
13 along with the plan, that this has not been fully planned  
14 out. And I think it's just getting crammed through. And  
15 I'm not happy with it going through my community at all. I  
16 think that indicates --

17           The terrain, the swamps, Bent Mountain -- it's  
18 just not a suitable place for the Mountain Valley Pipeline,  
19 much less the -- and also a national forest. I think that's  
20 a horrible place. That's -- it's not just my community, but  
21 that affects property that we all inherited.

22           MS. JAKE: My name is Carolyn Jake. It does not  
23 go through my land now if we go with the other alternative.  
24 It was about 200 feet from it. So I'm not exactly sure  
25 where it is at this point, but it's moved down --

1           MR. FRIEDMAN: You know, we have maps in the next  
2 room. You can find out exactly where it is.

3           MS. JAKE: Okay, on Thursday, December 18th,  
4 2014, where QET and Nextera hosted a community open house at  
5 the Days Inn Blacksburg to introduce, discuss and answer  
6 questions regarding the proposed MPV pipeline. Mr. Friedman  
7 told me and others that once a pipeline has been prefiled  
8 with FERC, it is usually approved by the Commission. After  
9 the final EIS is agreed and submitted to the Commission.

10           Mr. Friedman did not know of any case where the  
11 Commission did not approve the building of the pipeline.

12           MR. FRIEDMAN: Can I amend that now? I know of  
13 one case, called the Pacific Connector.

14           MS. JAKE: Okay. My problem is that I feel an  
15 impartial review is occurring. Very few of the mitigation  
16 plans requested have been received. And then there is no  
17 possibility for a no-action alternative under Section 3.1 in  
18 the draft EIS. In fact, since the no-action alternative has  
19 never been used, it appears that this is only a pretense  
20 based on FERC FY17 Budget Request where Objective 2.1 is to  
21 "foster economic and environmental benefits for the nation  
22 through the approval of natural gas and hydropower  
23 projects".

24           Furthermore, in the FERC FY17 Budget Request,  
25 there is no need for funding to be appropriated from

1 Congress since FERC operates on a full-cost recovery, also  
2 documented in the FERC FY17 Budget Request where "the  
3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, or the  
4 Commission recovers the full cost of its operations through  
5 annual charges and filing fees assessed on industries it  
6 regulates as authorized by the Federal Power Act and the  
7 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986. The Commission  
8 deposits this revenue into the treasury as directed offset  
9 to its appropriation resulting in no net appropriation."

10 So my question is, why do we appear to follow the  
11 NEPA process and not have a no-action alternative? My  
12 answer is that the process is unfair and allows for  
13 corporate greed to run our country. My suggestion is that  
14 FERC makes the MVP their first no-action alternative. Thank  
15 you.

16 MS. SHEA: Amy Shea. And no, the pipeline does  
17 not currently cross my property. I'm a Virginia native. I  
18 grew up on Wreck Island Creek in Appomattox County. Came to  
19 Virginia Tech in 1988, lived in various places throughout  
20 Virginia, but came back to southwest Virginia in '99 to  
21 raise my family. My teenagers live here with me. We've  
22 lived in Ironto on the bank of the north fork of the Roanoke  
23 River for 14 years, which is the longest I have ever lived  
24 anywhere. I love this area very much.

25 Water has always been very special to me. I've

1 always lived close to water and also I'm a Pagan, that's a  
2 nature-centered religion and water is extra special to me.  
3 I'll stick to that reason. As I was thinking about this  
4 issue and why I feel so passionate about it, I realize that  
5 to me one of the most outrageous parts is that water is one  
6 of our fundamental needs, along with good food and clean  
7 air.

8           We can't live without it. None of us can live  
9 without it. It's the great equalizer. No amount of  
10 material riches matter if our basic life needs aren't met.  
11 And water is a basic right. It's absolutely ridiculous that  
12 our water would be compromised this way.

13           And if you look at Maslow's hierarchy of needs,  
14 our physiological needs are at the bottom, the next tier up  
15 is safety, the other thing that the pipeline does is  
16 threatens our safety on a daily basis. Seems like part of  
17 our new reality is that pipelines are exploding, you know,  
18 day to day, and that's just craziness. We don't know the  
19 long-term effects of all this stuff, and we do know that our  
20 water is being poisoned, and none of us can live without  
21 that water.

22           There's a book called the The Water Knife by  
23 Paolo Bacigalupi. Came out a couple years ago and it's a  
24 post-apocalyptic book about water wars, and I believe that's  
25 what we're about to come up to next in our world, in our

1 life. It's a horror tale, it's a nightmare horror tale, and  
2 I feel like that is what we're getting ready to experience  
3 with these pipelines crisscrossing our country, we need to  
4 stop at this point in our evolution of the world, we should  
5 be moving toward clean energy, supposedly the world has come  
6 together and setting their goals by 2030, and instead of  
7 investing in new infrastructure, we need to be looking  
8 towards clean energy solutions. Water is life.

9 MR. DENNIS JONES: I'm Dennis Jones.

10 MR. LANDON JONES: Landon Jones.

11 MR. DENNIS JONES: Yeah, the pipeline is crossing  
12 our property at Mile Marker 215. And it actually belongs to  
13 my father, George Jones, but it's been in the family since  
14 1775, that whole tract. There's a lot of historical  
15 buildings there. There's a pole barns, barn that was built  
16 in 1930, and like I said, there's other pole barns and sheds  
17 that were built.

18 And we're just concerned -- there's a spring on  
19 dad's property that feeds two houses there -- there's three  
20 houses it feeds, and we're just concerned with the  
21 contaminated water from the pipeline. The spring is within  
22 probably 150 feet of the center line of the pipeline and  
23 we're concerned about the contaminated water.

24 We're concerned about the report of Ernst  
25 Kastnings. He's done a report and a lot of study on the

1 karst environment. Concerned about the sinkholes. Dad has  
2 sinkholes on his property. We brought it to the attention  
3 of Mountain Valley Pipeline and they appeared to ignore  
4 that. They've ignored the historical buildings up until --  
5 I think FERC maybe said something to 'em so they're -- I  
6 don't know if they've recognized it yet or not, but -- but  
7 anyway, we're just really concerned about the karst  
8 environment and the contaminated water. Hope that they'll  
9 take all that into consideration.

10 MR. MILLER: My name is Mark Miller. And the  
11 pipeline does not cross my property. I work with the  
12 Virginia Wilderness Committee. I'm the executive director  
13 of the organization. And the Virginia Wilderness Committee  
14 is opposed to the pipeline on national forestland and in  
15 particular, the Jefferson National Forest.

16 We are particularly distressed by the fact that  
17 it's going through the Brush Mountain inventoried roadless  
18 area, as well as underneath the Appalachian Trail and  
19 adjacent to the Peters Mountain Wilderness Area, as well as  
20 the Brush Mountain Wilderness Area.

21 We also are not too keen on the fact that the  
22 pipeline would cross, I think, 13,000 x-number of feet of  
23 semi-primitive, non-motorized land on the national forest.  
24 That is a very rare commodity on the forest. And if you put  
25 a pipeline right through the middle of it, it is still

1 non-motorized, but is no longer semi-primitive, because that  
2 semi-primitive nature would be negated by the fact that the  
3 pipeline is going through it.

4           We are also not real keen about the fact that  
5 there might be some old-growth that would be, you would have  
6 to harvest some old-growth in the construction of the  
7 pipeline. We are actually big believers in old-growth in  
8 that forest.

9           So to recap, we are opposed to it going through  
10 national forestland. We are opposed to it going through the  
11 Brush Mountain inventoried roadless area. We are opposed to  
12 it coming over Peters Mountain and Sinking Creek Mountain.  
13 We are opposed to the impacts it might have on the  
14 Appalachian Trail. We are opposed to it going through  
15 semi-primitive non-motorized land on the national forest and  
16 we are opposed to any harvesting of old-growth. Thank you.

17           MS. AMERSON: My name's Marilyn Amerson.

18           MR. AMERSON: Bobby Amerson.

19           MS. AMERSON: And the pipeline is coming close to  
20 our property, but not, does not cross it. I'm opposed to  
21 this project on three counts, first of which is public  
22 safety. The second is the negative effects on the  
23 environment, and the third is the economic impact.

24           According to the Center for Effective Government,  
25 since 2010, more than 3,300 gas leaks or ruptures have



1 occurred in the United States. In September 2015 a 30"  
2 pipeline exploded in New Mexico and left a crater more than  
3 46 feet long and 20 feet deep. Ten members of a family were  
4 killed. In 2010, a 30" pipeline ruptured in San Bruno,  
5 California, resulting in a crater 72 feet long by 26 feet  
6 wide. A 28-foot section of pipe was found 100 feet south of  
7 the crater. The resulting fire from the explosion killed  
8 eight people and damaged 70 homes.

9           The Jonesville Road, where I live, it's a  
10 dead-end road. The mountains surround the valley, and  
11 that's past the point where the pipeline'll cross the only  
12 road into that area. In the event of a fire or explosion,  
13 there are more than a dozen families who would have no  
14 escape route and it's a remote area, and most of us don't  
15 even have cell phone service. We couldn't even call for  
16 help.

17           We don't understand why the pipeline companies  
18 are willing to build those roads to get farmers to sell them  
19 easements and alternative route for farm equipment  
20 transportation, but they're unwilling to address the matter  
21 of public safety.

22           My second opposition on the environmental impact.  
23 We feel that the Environmental Impact Statement does not  
24 accurately describe the impact this project will really have  
25 in this area. The statement says the pipeline would be

1 minimally invasive and affecting mainly forestlands.

2 However, the region has very rocky areas.

3           When I was younger, the road that was widened and  
4 hard-surfaced through our land became a long-term project  
5 because of all the rock that had to be blasted, even though  
6 a road bed already existed there. Even today there's a  
7 phone line that's routed from the utility pole 50 yards from  
8 our home, because they can't put it in the ground, because  
9 it's solid rock.

10           The area is also subject to hillside erosion.  
11 And mudslides pop up whether or not the landscape is covered  
12 with vegetation. With the clay soil, deforestation leads to  
13 even more erosion on hillsides, and growing grass is almost  
14 impossible. VDOT currently wants to rip out the gulley on  
15 our in our property, because we've been told grass won't  
16 grow there.

17           The blasting that will be required to bury a  
18 pipeline of such massive size will destroy the wells, fresh  
19 mountain water, damage the foundations of homes for untold  
20 numbers of people who, just like me, own land close to the  
21 route, but have no legal rights because we don't own the  
22 land the pipeline will cross.

23           This is very troublesome because the pipeline  
24 survey doesn't seem to have examined the topography of these  
25 properties. Pipeline routes are changed on a whim with the

1 discovery of bats or Indian artifacts, or even stiff  
2 opposition. Not once have we seen a study that says a  
3 chosen route was selected because of the land lends itself  
4 to a lower chance of negative environmental effects.

5           Which doesn't allow me to address the economic  
6 impacts, which the -- we feel the pipeline companies are  
7 making huge profit, but the people in the area are going to  
8 suffer because of lower property values, and also pollution,  
9 watershed damage. My father, my grandfather owned the land  
10 where we live. He lost it in the Great Depression. My  
11 father came back and bought this land with money that he  
12 made fighting for this country in World War II in the  
13 Philippines.

14           This area doesn't even need this much natural  
15 gas. Because fracking has already been outlawed in New  
16 York. It's come under fire in other areas. A recent  
17 article -- I'll wrap up, but I'll say this. To give someone  
18 three minutes to express their views on a --

19           MR. FRIEDMAN: That's why we're also taking  
20 written records. If you want to give me that --

21           MS. AMERSON: I'll put it in the record, thank  
22 you. And I'll put it on --

23           MS. SIEGEL: My name is Cristina Siegel. The  
24 pipeline would not cross my land, but it is right across the  
25 street. I wanna start out by saying that I, by training, a

1 forest soil scientist. I worked four years as a researcher  
2 for the forestry department, and I actually did create --  
3 EIS is some of our efforts, our research projects. And did  
4 a lot of work to mitigate the effects of these kind of big  
5 activities on the land.

6 I am now the director of a non-profit  
7 organization that focuses on environmental issues. And I  
8 live within half a mile of the proposed corridor, as the  
9 crow flies. I have a 34-acre tract of beautiful land in  
10 Franklin County, and I actually still live on property that  
11 the pipeline goes through right now, and we thought about  
12 buying that house. So this is -- it's in my neighborhood --  
13 it's something I've been working on for years, and I care  
14 deeply about it.

15 I do believe that the draft EIS is deeply flawed,  
16 based on my professional opinion, and completely inadequate.  
17 And for the reasons, I've grouped them by topic. The  
18 environmental impacts, Number One. The hydrology of the  
19 region, the numbers of springs and creeks and wetlands, and  
20 the extremely steep terrain. On my property alone, I  
21 probably have three different creeks, a number of wetlands.  
22 And I know, right across the road, where the pipeline is  
23 going, is very similar terrain. Steep, rugged, rocky.

24 Soil erosion, something I worked on  
25 professionally for years. Landslides on steep lands. When

1 you are putting in pipelines and you are leaving open areas  
2 of 50 to 75 feet, it creates tremendous soil disturbance and  
3 soil erosion. They do not adequately address that in the  
4 EIS. And neither do they have the capacity to monitor  
5 those, should it go in, to monitor the activities during the  
6 process or after the process, with our current state  
7 resources.

8           Herbicide control of right-of-ways. In order to  
9 keep the land clear, they have to do it one way or the  
10 other. And I know that it's impossible to do it by hand, so  
11 then you've got herbicides sprayed on steep slopes, which  
12 then  
13 can -- then soil detaches and can get into our creeks and  
14 waterways.

15           Forest fragmentation is a serious issue. It's a  
16 problem for both forest habitat and for many of our wildlife  
17 that live in the area. I'm deeply concerned.

18           Also public safety. I live within a half mile of  
19 this. I'm concerned about pipes blowing up, pipes leaking,  
20 all the safety hazards that go along. And property values.  
21 That is something that could directly affect me. Loss of  
22 property value. And I'm deeply disturbed by the imminent  
23 domain -- taking of land for unsubstantiated public good.  
24 These are commercial efforts for commercial gain and they  
25 have not, in any way whatsoever supported that this is good

1 for the public.

2           And I have a fundamental belief that we need to  
3 move away from fossil fuels. This is exactly the wrong way  
4 to go, to create hundreds of miles of disturbance for  
5 another fossil fuel. Thank you very much.

6           MS. ROSTON: Margaret Roston. [The pipeline]  
7 does not cross my land. It's on the adjacent property. The  
8 no-action alternative is the logical choice. MVP repeatedly  
9 deserves an "F" for its failure to provide accurate  
10 information.

11           Every time FERC asks for information, they only  
12 give partial answers and often they're not addressing the  
13 issue. Their reports have been full of so much stuff, they  
14 should've been thrown out because it's a waste of FERC's  
15 time to even consider it. If they were in school, they  
16 handed in those reports, they would've gotten "F"s and the  
17 teacher would've said forget it, you fail.

18           There's nothing American about taking a citizen's  
19 land against their will for pennies of value by a for-profit  
20 company for export. Lots of people have probably talked  
21 about the karst, the earthquake zone, and virtually  
22 continuous seismic activity.

23           Probably they haven't talked about inadequate  
24 insurances required to pay for long-term infrastructure  
25 damage or a mega-disaster and certainly not several

1 disasters at one time as LLC MVP can walk away. This is  
2 just not fair. Can dump it all on the taxpayers.

3           What I'm curious about is who's going to restore  
4 the compacted soil. Working on a job site right now with a  
5 remodeling thing and all these people are doing is walking  
6 around. We're gonna actually have to spend a bunch of money  
7 to have -- we've had three days of light equipment driving  
8 around, the ground is packed down solid, and we're gonna  
9 have to dig it all up to be able to get anything to grow.  
10 Who's gonna pay for that. They're not gonna do it on the  
11 hillsides or anything.

12           Also, who's gonna make sure the noxious weeds do  
13 not grow up where intact forest once stood? Or a  
14 well-tended field once was. Also, there's a narrow driveway  
15 right near us going to a telecommunications tower. It washes  
16 out with each moderate to heavy downpour, and it's very  
17 unsafe to have gravel on the road, because it washes down  
18 into our roads, and this is only one pickup truck wide.  
19 It's going to be a nightmare when this thing is there, if  
20 it's there.

21           Who's gonna remove the toxins from the pipeline  
22 when it is abandoned? Who's gonna fill in the pipeline so  
23 it does not collapse in places becoming a fun, yet dangerous  
24 place for children to play? Or animals to live. Who is  
25 going to make sure that the disintegrating abandoned

1 pipeline does not route water from one place to another?

2 I hope that, if this pipeline is permitted by  
3 FERC--I definitely don't want it--that FERC will do so only  
4 if they forbid MVP to build a compressor station in  
5 Virginia. And it is way too much of a coincidence that  
6 after the number of people protesting increased due to the  
7 compressor station showing up. Then they sudden took it out  
8 in Virginia. My husband just had a major heart attack due  
9 to all the stress that we've been under, and we can't sell  
10 our house and we've gotta downsize. We've worked three  
11 years to build this property up. It's now worth zero  
12 because nobody's looking at it.

13 MS. SHERMAN: Ruth Sherman. So karst land is  
14 composed of sinkholes, springs and caves. The proposed  
15 pipeline cannot be safely built in most of southwest  
16 Virginia due to the karst land, the steep mountain slopes,  
17 and the potential for serious erosion.

18 This pipeline will cause irreparable damage to  
19 the fragile mountain ecosystems, destroy the groundwater and  
20 surface water resources. MVP should not be approved.

21 MR. HEIL: My name is Ellison Heil. So there's  
22 an individual that stepped in here earlier. You all may  
23 remember him. His name was Bear Redstar. He was from North  
24 Dakota. He was just very intrigued by the similarities  
25 being tied between those individuals currently in Standing



1 Rock, North Dakota, fighting the Dakota Access Pipeline, and  
2 those individuals who are standing together in the  
3 Appalachia's of West Virginia and Virginia, and would like  
4 to draw similarities between these two current issues  
5 presenting themselves in the United States.

6           And then secondly are my concerns about the karst  
7 topography in this region, having just returned from Nepal  
8 back in 2015, I felt the severity of what an earthquake can  
9 do to a community, and while southwest Virginia may never  
10 see the intensity on a Richter scale that Nepal experienced  
11 back in 2015, a small earthquake could have devastating  
12 impacts on this community, especially if a pipeline was to  
13 go through the area and cause destruction to our water in  
14 this area.

15           Companies such as Deschutes have picked Virginia  
16 in particular, Roanoke because of our high-quality water and  
17 having pipelines come through this area could be destructive  
18 to future organization and institutions finding themselves  
19 in the Roanoke and New River Valleys. Thank you.

20           MR. PECKMAN: My name is Robert, otherwise known  
21 as Bob, Peckman. No, [the pipeline] does not [cross my  
22 property]. First comment on the draft EIS is -- I have seen  
23 many DEIS's and I have never seen one for a project that had  
24 not yet been defined. But the -- the scoping out the  
25 properties hasn't even been completed -- so I don't see how

1 you could write the DEIS.

2           The DEIS in the executive summary says that there  
3 will be limited negative impacts. That's a value judgment.  
4 It says that the FERC is already making decisions, even  
5 though the project hasn't been fully defined yet. They  
6 don't have the data in yet. They're supposed to be  
7 gathering data, and yet they're making decisions. And that  
8 may be true that it's limited, but that doesn't mean that  
9 the negative impacts are not huge. And in fact, they're  
10 much less than the positive impacts of having the pipeline.

11           For example, it's assumed that the pipeline is  
12 not gonna leaked. It's assumed that the pipeline's not  
13 gonna break. There are a lot of assumptions made. Having  
14 worked in the industry with dangerous things, when you're  
15 looking for safety you don't assume something's not gonna  
16 happen. You assume that the bad things are gonna happen and  
17 you figure out what you're gonna do for them. So just  
18 saying, "well, we're probably not gonna get an earthquake in  
19 the next 20 years, and the pipeline'll probably be gone by  
20 then," that's any way to do safety.

21           The pipeline will have negative impacts that last  
22 much longer than the positive impacts. The pipeline is  
23 designed to be built on grades that don't really heal after  
24 you mess them up. Now I work with the Appalachian Trail  
25 Conservancy and we build trails. The Appalachian Trail up

1 in Roanoke. And we build trails to a maximum grade of 15%.  
2 We go out a clinometer and we measure. We don't build  
3 anything greater than 15% because greater than that will  
4 erode.

5 Now if you look at Tinker Mountain. I think if I  
6 see it from here, if you look at Tinker Mountain with all  
7 the telephone towers on top, etcetera, you'll see there's a  
8 piece of ground that has slid from being cleared for the  
9 power lines and that was decades ago, and it hasn't healed.  
10 And has no sign of healing.

11 FERC, the DEIS just doesn't take into account the  
12 losses --

13 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Peter Anderson. And  
14 I'm here representing Appalachian Voices, which is a  
15 regional non-profit organization.

16 The Mountain Valley Pipeline project is not in  
17 the public interest and I urge you to reject its  
18 application. First, it is not necessary and FERC cannot  
19 show a public need for it. Recent studies by Synapse  
20 Economics and the Institute for Energy Economics and  
21 Financial Analysis demonstrate that existing gas  
22 infrastructure is more than sufficient to meet regional  
23 energy needs for residents and businesses.

24 The primary beneficiaries of this project will be  
25 private energy developers. This is deeply concerning given

1 that a certificate of public convenience and necessity would  
2 allow for the taking of private property for this project.

3           Second, public safety is at great risk. The  
4 draft EIS provides no reason for people living within the  
5 blast radius to feel safe. There has been in a spike in  
6 pipeline leaks and explosions, especially involving  
7 infrastructure installed this decade.

8           Third, water quality is of great concern. The  
9 MVP's proposed route would cross hundreds of water bodies  
10 and drinking water sources. Yet the DEIS merely says that  
11 MVP would evaluate complaints and identify suitable  
12 settlements if drinking water is contaminated. This is  
13 insufficient and recklessly places profits above public  
14 health and safety.

15           Fourth, the DEIS fails to adequately address the  
16 greenhouse gas life cycle, including upstream and downstream  
17 leaks and combustion emissions. This is insufficient  
18 analysis under NEPA and NEPA jurisprudence.

19           Fifth, the DEIS concedes permanent adverse  
20 impacts to forests, including thousands of acres of prime  
21 forests, farmland, and listed species' habitats. The U.S.  
22 Forest Service has raised several of these issues, yet they  
23 have so far been largely ignored by FERC and the MVP project  
24 partners.

25           Sixth, the DEIS states that one West Virginia

1 compressor station will violate air quality standards and  
2 require a permit from that state environmental agency.  
3 There's also evidence in record in Montgomery County,  
4 Virginia, that MVP developers continue to attempt to site a  
5 fourth compressor station in the county after MVP submitted  
6 its application to FERC last fall. FERC must state  
7 definitively whether additional compression will be required  
8 along the pipeline route and if so, it must consider the  
9 impacts of additional compression within the context of the  
10 proposal, including cumulative effects.

11           Finally, the environmental justice analysis in  
12 the DEIS is grossly insufficient. 14 of 17 counties along  
13 the route have poverty rates above state averages, yet the  
14 DEIS states that environmental impacts will be somehow  
15 mitigated by local spending during construction. Any  
16 temporary economic bump provides does nothing to reduce  
17 environmental and public health impacts.

18           So again, the MVP is not in the public interest,  
19 and for these reasons, I urge you to reject the Mountain  
20 Valley Pipeline application. Thank you.

21           MS. DUVALL: My name is Megan Duvall. My main  
22 comment is regarding the amendment to the U.S. Forest  
23 Service Plan. I oppose the project's specific amendments,  
24 ones that would exceed restrictions on soil and riparian  
25 corridor conditions, that would remove old-growth trees and

1 that would cross the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

2 I also oppose the pipeline because I believe that  
3 it is dangerous and benefits only a very few people and our  
4 focus needs to be on investing in new technology and new  
5 industries that are clean energy.

6 MS. BOSTIC: My name is Janice Bostic. And I am  
7 not a landowner. So I'm here also on behalf of my  
8 grandparents who were subsistence farmers George and Leona  
9 Shiars, born and raised and buried in Craig County.

10 Fracking is not taking our country forward. It  
11 is only for the short-term gain of a few, at a price to the  
12 many that is spelled tragedy. Craig County does not have  
13 the money, equipment, or manpower to handle accidents, much  
14 less explosions along the route of the pipeline, nor does  
15 Giles County.

16 Pumping high-pressure natural gas through a 42"  
17 pipeline has not been done before. And they want to do it  
18 across private and forest service lands filled with  
19 wildlife, sinkholes, caves, over rocky, steep terrain with  
20 mountain streams and aquifers. It is pure madness. It is  
21 motivated only by greed, devoid of common sense or reason.

22 The ugly scar that would be running across our  
23 area would be a detriment to our economy. People are moving  
24 and settling here for the views, the hiking, the outdoor  
25 life. The eyesore and danger that a 42" high-pressure

1 pipeline would cause provides zero economic gain. In fact,  
2 a negative impact. Again, it would be only for the  
3 short-term profits of a few.

4           FERC's mission statement: Assist consumers in  
5 obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy  
6 services at a reasonable cost through appropriate regulatory  
7 and market means. Fracked gas is not efficient, nor is it  
8 sustainable. High-pressure pipelines are not reliable nor  
9 sustainable.

10           The cost. What is the cost? Lowered property  
11 values, lost tourist dollars, clean-ups, and no one is  
12 calculating the true environmental human cost of fracking.  
13 This proposed pipeline, pumping fracked gas through our area  
14 with no benefit to us, but only opening up for loss and for  
15 danger environmentally and economically, would seem to be  
16 contrary to the mission statement of FERC. Please say no  
17 and disallow this MVP pipeline.

18           MR. BESKAR: My name is Herb Beskar. I live in  
19 Roanoke City, and no, the pipeline would not affect my  
20 property. Well, first of all, I would just like to  
21 prologue, I guess, my comments a bit. And that is, the  
22 editorial in today's paper, unfortunately, summed it up  
23 pretty good, I thought. And that is the difficulty in  
24 believing in the integrity of the process with the fossil  
25 fuel industry so influential with FERC and even funding of

1 their work.

2           But be that as it may, I would like to address  
3 some specific environmental issues. Since I'm not directly  
4 affected by the pipeline, I have friends who are up on that  
5 mountain and so on, but being in Roanoke City, the specific  
6 environmental issue that I'm concerned is about water.

7 Since Roanoke City receives a bunch of its water from  
8 upstream on the Roanoke River and from that catchment area.

9           Specifically the issue of erosion -- first of  
10 all, just the disruption of the streams and rivers during  
11 construction, inevitably that is going to cause tremendous  
12 amount of sediment and debris going into the water streams.  
13 And then because of the geological features of that area  
14 with the karst formations and so on, it's just inevitable  
15 that during construction and especially afterwards, there is  
16 going to be -- any leak over those formations will go down  
17 to the water table which will affect wells and the water  
18 through the water table that Roanoke City receives from the  
19 river and even from their pumping.

20           And we've had a number of leaks and breaks and  
21 explosions lately in pipelines around the country. Alabama  
22 last week. And so it's inevitable that there is going to be  
23 environmental damage specifically to our water supply. And  
24 unfortunately I don't know -- there's no way that the  
25 industry can say it will not happen, and based on history,



1 it will happen. So in terms of rivers and streams, I would  
2 think that's a significant environmental impact.

3           And then the other water issue would be  
4 individuals with private wells. I know a number of people  
5 in the Bent Mountain area in Montgomery County who have  
6 private wells, who have the pipeline going very close to  
7 their homes, if they aren't losing their homes as it is. So  
8 the private wells are under great threat.

9           And then I would like to just -- another issue  
10 is, just very briefly, and that is -- it's not addressed in  
11 this impact statement, but that is -- we're speaking of  
12 specific environmental concerns and that is -- the big  
13 picture is that if we continue to use fossil fuels at the  
14 rate we are and don't cut back faster, we are truly  
15 threatening the earth environment. We're threatening our  
16 very civilization, not only in our country, but on the  
17 planet. Thank you very much.

18           MS. RICE: My name is Jane Rice. And the  
19 pipeline does not cross any of my property. So I came in  
20 this room multiple times before you people as you are aware  
21 and as I was doing that, I noticed people said a lot of  
22 repetitive things that I'm sure you're heard multiple times.  
23 Been in here all night listening to everyone's comments.  
24 And while I do agree with all of those, they've already been  
25 said.

1           So I'm not gonna go over all of those, the  
2 topography and the beautifulness and yada-yada that you've  
3 heard, probably through your whole process of this. But I  
4 do agree with them and since I've been here all day, I  
5 thought I would come in and just state my opposition to the  
6 Mountain Valley Pipeline.

7           I'm a student at Roanoke College, a junior  
8 studying environmental science. I enjoy it a lot. I'm from  
9 Charleston, South Carolina, which I'm not sure if you've  
10 been there or not, but it's totally flat. No mountains,  
11 below sea level. Love it though.

12           And I came to Roanoke because I wanted to have a  
13 change of scenery and see the mountains. I went from the  
14 beach to the mountains. And you see all the pictures, the  
15 Blue Ridge Parkway and Appalachian Mountains, but it really  
16 is -- and you hear about how beautiful it is -- but you  
17 really can't appreciate it, I personally think, until you  
18 see it, until you hike up McAfee Knob and Devil's Marble  
19 Yard and Sawtooth, and all that and just, like the miserable  
20 hike up it, and then you just get stunned by the beauty and  
21 awe. The millions of photos that you've seen just don't put  
22 it into words or how amazing it really is.

23           And I also don't have much of any type of  
24 background. I don't know much about pipelines. I honest --  
25 I couldn't tell you if a pipe, what pipelines are in South

1 Carolina, but the Roanoke College has encouraged us to be  
2 aware of what's going on in our communities, everything  
3 that's going on.

4           So the environmental science program is really up  
5 with Mountain Valley Pipeline as it's -- not project -- but  
6 encouraged us so much to learn as much as we can about it.  
7 And it really -- just my first experience with the mountains  
8 and to learn about a pipeline, it just -- I don't wanna say  
9 the word. It did kind of hit me all at once, I guess is the  
10 best way to put it. And I -- that's why I decided to come  
11 and be so involved and do everything that I can with the  
12 Appalachian Trail Club and Conservancy and everything else,  
13 help them record people and all of that, so --

14           For me, I just wanted to come and state my  
15 thoughts and state my opposition and -- I don't know if  
16 you've been hiking around here, but I really encourage you  
17 to go hike McAfee Knob or Shark Top, and just really see how  
18 beautiful it is here, because it is life-changing and it is  
19 amazing and it's the best feeling in the world to hike up a  
20 mountain and see just how wonderful this earth is. And I  
21 don't think a pipeline should cross through that. That's  
22 all I have to say.

23           MR. KASTNING: First name is Ernst. Last name is  
24 Kastning. I am not a landowner. I live nearby. I own  
25 land, but it's not -- the pipeline does not cross my --

1           In July I submitted an 80-page report on the  
2 geological hazards related to the pipeline. It was  
3 submitted to FERC on behalf of Sierra Club out of  
4 Charlottesville, and on behalf of POWHR. That report went  
5 in in July. I am not certain whether it has been reviewed  
6 by FERC because of the timing. My only comment is that if  
7 it has not been reviewed, it's 80 pages of text, very  
8 detailed about the geology. If it has not been reviewed, I  
9 want it to be looked at.

10           MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll stop you right here. I'll  
11 stop the clock. Yes, I know. I have just started to peruse  
12 it --

13           MR. KASTNING: But you answered my question. I  
14 actually wasn't gonna do anything here. But then I talked  
15 --

16           MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, you can go. I just wanted  
17 to give you that information. You asked a question, I  
18 answered it.

19           MR. KASTNING: Okay, good. It's very important  
20 that the implications of the geologic hazards that I address  
21 be looked at. I'm most concerned about the karst part  
22 because even though just about every karst feature within  
23 the pipeline proposed corridor is listed, I am not certain  
24 about the fact that they're all those features there and  
25 there were two connected beneath the ground. I'm not

1 certain if that part has been addressed appropriately, that  
2 this is a large system of groundwater, and that's really my  
3 concern.

4 MR. REED: My name is Ernest Reed. I am an  
5 intervenor with this. I also represent three groups that  
6 are also intervening in the process, Wild Virginia, Friends  
7 of Nelson and Heartwood. I do not own property that this is  
8 going through, with the exception of the Jefferson National  
9 Forest.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right, because all Americans own  
11 the national forests.

12 MR. REED: I didn't even have to say that. I'm  
13 mostly concerned today for this three minutes about the area  
14 that goes through the Jefferson National Forest. The route  
15 that goes by Peters Mountain Wilderness along Mystery Ridge,  
16 there's a spring at the intersection of the access road and  
17 Mystery Ridge Road which is right on the route. It's  
18 well-flagged in blue flag tape. I was up there two weeks  
19 ago to see it, not mentioned in the DEIS. I can't  
20 understand why it would be flagged and made such a big deal  
21 of on site, but it's not mentioned in the DEIS.

22 Also, the route as it comes down on the edge of  
23 Peters Mountain, if there's a 125-foot construction corridor  
24 there, it's gonna compromise the wilderness values of the  
25 wilderness, because of the visual quality and also the

1 intrusion of invasive species and predatory species into the  
2 wilderness area. There's a population of Native American  
3 Chestnuts in Peters Mountain wilderness and there's also  
4 chestnut trees that are sprouting from seed that are right  
5 adjacent to the center line of the ACP as it's proposed to  
6 go through there. And they do not have chestnut.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: This is not about the ACP. This  
8 is Mountain Valley.

9 MR. REED: I meant Mountain Valley. I'm sorry.  
10 I meant MVP. There's also a population of hemlock that do  
11 not have all the data there. I've got photographs of them.  
12 I'll be submitting them with my further comments when I send  
13 those in. So those are very problematic. The Brush  
14 Mountain wilderness that the MVP would be running adjacent  
15 to is going through an inventoried roadless area. That  
16 inventoried roadless area does not allow the cutting of  
17 trees any larger in diameter than 12" because that's what  
18 the roadless rule specifies.

19 I don't imagine that it will be possible to build  
20 that route without cutting those trees. Also, there can't  
21 be any access roads in that roadless area by definition, nor  
22 can vehicles use the proposed route as a vehicular access in  
23 the future. It would seem to be inconsistent with the  
24 roadless rule. So that I think that that's a conflict that  
25 can't really be resolved or mitigated along with those

1 wilderness areas. I'm done.

2 MR. BRISTOLL: My name is Benjamin Bristoll. I  
3 do not own land that the pipeline crosses. I live in  
4 Roanoke here, but not where the pipeline will be here.

5 MS. D'GAIA: Gayla D'Gaia. I live in Roanoke  
6 City and I do not live where a pipeline is gonna directly  
7 cross.

8 MR. BRISTOLL: I guess I -- there's so much to  
9 say, but I -- I asked that you please oppose approval of  
10 this pipeline because I feel that it endangers the safety of  
11 a lot of people going all through the area here, because of  
12 the unstable terrain and I've seen how many pipeline  
13 explosions have been in recent years.

14 I also think that it's not needed because it's  
15 mostly just being built to export the gas overseas and not  
16 to be used for domestic use, so that does not -- I don't  
17 think that constitutes a public good use. That's more of a  
18 private commercial enterprise for profit that's not serving  
19 the public interest. So for those reasons, I ask that you  
20 deny this pipeline approval.

21 MS. D'GAIA: I oppose the pipeline for the  
22 reasons of the inability for citizens to be able to monitor  
23 or have any real control over the regulation of the  
24 pipelines. I'm also very concerned about the direction that  
25 our markets are going, currently with a, with an overstock

1 of these types of resources.

2 I'm not exactly sure if the gas pipeline issue is  
3 in the same ballfield as the Exxon issues that are coming  
4 up, where there's just too much and stocks are decreasing.  
5 But I also recognize the impact of the fossil fuels on our  
6 economy and know that we really do have to work together on  
7 finding a solution to move us out of these very precarious  
8 situations where we are really damaging lives and putting  
9 lives at risk, and also damaging the environment and the  
10 structure beneath the ground, creating leaks and things like  
11 that.

12 And I feel like our best cause is basically being  
13 to really find a way to instigate the type of change that  
14 would have people who are investing, the stockholders and  
15 the companies and the private interests, to begin to change  
16 that route. And if there is some reason why that really,  
17 really can't happen, other than it's just, that's the way  
18 they want it to be, then I would like to see real  
19 information come out to the public about why that is.

20 I know that there is United States economy and  
21 the global economy are dependent on our interests in fossil  
22 fuels, but I do think that we really have to move away from  
23 that. And I'm not asking anyone to do anything that I  
24 myself have not done, because I have been in a situation to  
25 be married to a person of great wealth, we're talking not



1 millions of dollars, we're talking in the billions of  
2 dollars, and what I can say is that, at the end of the day,  
3 it really is not worth putting so many lives at risk and the  
4 environment at risk, to do these things.

5           We can do better. And I really wanna support  
6 just a very deep heart-felt response from FERC and from the  
7 private interests that are involved in this. And I  
8 appreciate you doing that.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

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

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC

8 EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT

9

10

11

12

13 Docket No.: CP16-10-000

14 CP16-13-000

15 Place: Roanoke, Virginia

16 Date: November 3, 2016

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

21

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF:	: Project No.
MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE LLC	: CP16-10-000
EQUITRANS EXPANSION PROJECT	: CP16-13-000

- - - - - x

Sheraton-Roanoke Hotel &  
Conference Center  
2801 Hershberger Road  
Roanoke, Virginia 24017

Thursday, November 3, 2016

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. CAYWOOD: Richard Caywood. I am the  
3 Assistant County Administrator for Roanoke County and I'm  
4 here today to speak on behalf of Roanoke County and the  
5 Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. I'd like to start by  
6 expressing Roanoke County's concern with the public input  
7 process being utilized by FERC tonight.

8 While FERC has utilized the term public input  
9 sessions, the process being utilized is, by its very nature,  
10 not public, is we are sitting in a room with three people  
11 and closed doors. Public involvement on projects governed  
12 by the NEPA process and the FERC approval process should be  
13 just that -- public.

14 An important aspect of public involvement is the  
15 opportunity for citizens to hear the opinions of their  
16 fellow citizens and learn from one another. Therefore, it  
17 defies logic that FERC is taking public input privately.  
18 FERC indicates that it will transcribe and publish every  
19 comment in the project register. Therefore, it seems highly  
20 inappropriate and illogical to take these very same comments  
21 privately.

22 FERC accepts comments by mail or electronically  
23 throughout the project approval process. The notion that  
24 FERC must take public comments privately because some  
25 individuals are reluctant to speak in front of crowds or due

1 to time constraints seems disingenuous at best.

2           It seems abundantly clear that the primary  
3 objective of FERC in making this change in its public input  
4 process is to avoid creating a public forum and to further  
5 avoid community awareness of concerns about these very  
6 substantial projects. While true public hearings can be  
7 uncomfortable and occasionally unruly, they are a critical  
8 component of projects with public oversight.

9           Roanoke County, for example, uses true public  
10 hearings on all of our rezoning projects, rezoning processes  
11 in the county, and we have often very long meetings and  
12 people have very heated feelings. However, we've always  
13 seen the importance in taking the comments of this nature in  
14 a public forum for all to see, the media, citizens. We even  
15 run those meetings on TV for people to see.

16           Roanoke County respectfully implores the FERC to  
17 reconsider this effort to redefine the public participation  
18 in the projects it regulates. Roanoke County is also  
19 concerned about the very incomplete state of the DEIS at the  
20 time of its release by FERC. Today is November 3rd. On  
21 Monday, October 31st, I received literally thousands of  
22 pages of additional materials to supplement the recently  
23 published DEIS. This material was substantially more  
24 voluminous than the actual document itself.

25           Since one of the main components of the

1 supplemental materials was the actual proposed pipeline  
2 alignment, it seems very hard to believe that the DEIS  
3 would've been published in advance of that information.  
4 Therefore, Roanoke County would request consideration for  
5 extending the public comment period and republishing the  
6 DEIS in a more complete form. I appreciate the ability to  
7 comment.

8 MS. GIVENS: My name is Karolyn Givens. And our  
9 farm is located at 199 Leffel Lane in Newport, Virginia.  
10 I'm a member of the organization Preserve Historic Newport  
11 Properties, an organization dedicated to preserving this  
12 historic community. I want to tell you about the village of  
13 Newport, part of the Newport Historic District, which sits  
14 at the base of Sinking Creek Mountain, and about the Greater  
15 Newport Rural Historic District located in Sinking Creek  
16 Valley, which extends along the Blue Grass Trail east of the  
17 village.

18 Sinking Creek has been farm since colonial times,  
19 before the revolution. My husband, who is now 80, grew up  
20 in that valley in a house that his great-great-grandfather  
21 built in 1790, and that his great-grandfather, his  
22 grandfather, his father and he, my husband, were all born  
23 in. That is the nature of the beautiful Sinking Creek  
24 Valley. The people who migrated west from colonial  
25 settlements to the east, and some who stayed and continued

1 to farm that valley for generations.

2           Newport Village and the Greater Newport Rural  
3 Historic District includes houses, farmhouses and barns and  
4 outbuildings, churches, an old iron ore furnace, old wagon  
5 creek wheel roads and bridges, including three covered  
6 bridges. Centuries-old springs up on Sinking Creek Mountain  
7 have fed water to the farmhouses, as well as to the cattle,  
8 horses, goats, sheep and chickens raised on those farms.  
9 And that irrigated the crop lands of hay and corn. This  
10 agricultural community has thrived since the 1700s.

11           Newport is but one of eight historic communities  
12 nestled in the Appalachian Mountains that the Mountain  
13 Valley Pipeline threatens to tear apart with the current  
14 proposed route. The pipeline is slated to come in from the  
15 north of Newport Village next to the historic Mt. Olivet  
16 Church across from the Hardwick House. From there the  
17 pipeline will cross the Blue Grass Trail and rip right  
18 through 80-year-old Mr. Earl Eckles' property. He has been  
19 told by MVP that he will simply have to give up his home and  
20 relocate.

21           The proposed pipeline will continue on close to  
22 the Newport Volunteer Rescue Squad housed in the vocational  
23 agricultural building of the historic Newport High School,  
24 and now the Newport Recreation Center and Fairgrounds. And  
25 next to the ballfield where, for generations, children have



1 come to play ball, the Newport Recreational Center and  
2 Fairgrounds is where the oldest continuous annual  
3 agricultural fair in Virginia is held.

4           From there, the pipeline is scheduled to cross up  
5 over the hill, turn east and then as it is constructed,  
6 devastate one farm after another in the greater Newport  
7 Rural Historic District. That destruction will include our  
8 historic Leffel Farm, which my husband and I have farmed for  
9 decades, and the George Jones Farm--George is 87--a farm  
10 which has been existence since the Revolution, and is now  
11 being farmed by younger members of the family.

12           So the Mountain Valley Pipeline will ravish the  
13 village and the pristine farms and the valley beyond. But  
14 in addition to the pipeline, MVP will use 7 Oaks Road, a  
15 gravel country road that runs along a spring-fed creek,  
16 leading from Blue Grass Trail up a relatively steep hill,  
17 eventually within feet of a farmhouse that sits on the side  
18 of 7 Oak Road. MVP plans to use 7 Oaks Road as an access  
19 road by constructing an extension up to the pipeline.

20           Jude and Jerilyn Deplasse[SP] own and farm  
21 7 Oaks Farm and they have for over fifty years. They've  
22 raised grass-fed beef, goats, horses, chickens and ducks.  
23 They chose that farm because it was at the end of the road,  
24 a peaceful haven. Jude will tell Jerilyn in the morning as  
25 he goes out the door that he's moving the cattle from Fossil

1 Ridge over to the north pasture up to the meadow.

2 MR. OWEN: My name is Clark Owen. I'm a resident  
3 of Roanoke County. I'm here to represent my son, whose name  
4 is Richard Clark Owen. He's a resident of Hanover County,  
5 but he owns property in Franklin County, and my property is  
6 in Roanoke County.

7 I live at the foot of Bent Mountain and Poor  
8 Mountain, which is downhill from the proposed Mountain  
9 Valley Pipeline. My only concern about it would be the  
10 watershed. I'm on a well system, and being downhill, I'm  
11 close to both mountains. Obviously if there was a major  
12 problem, my watershed could be affected.

13 My son, however, and his mother has a life estate  
14 in his property, which is on Wildwood Road near Boones Mill  
15 in Franklin County. It's right in the crosshairs of the  
16 pipeline and Mountain Valley wants to put in a staging area  
17 and maintenance area and have a permanent right-of-way. And  
18 that property is within the blast zone, which is I  
19 understand is a couple hundred yards from the center in each  
20 direction. So that's two properties that are in question.

21 I understand that FERC's responsibility is to  
22 weigh the public benefit of this project versus the  
23 potential harm. And those affected are -- many in rural  
24 areas are not able to "hook up", you know if it was a road  
25 or an electrical line or something, they would be able to

1 hook up to the thing so they get really zero benefit if it  
2 was a road or power line or something, they could at least  
3 use that, so in my opinion, there is little or no public  
4 benefit, certainly to the citizens that could be affected.

5 But there is damage potential, watershed,  
6 explosion. We've had the two in Alabama, one in  
7 Pennsylvania County where this pipeline is to connect with  
8 another one. And that would be, you know, my opinion  
9 overall and the reason if FERC is following the goal of  
10 weighing the public benefit versus the potential harm, it  
11 should deny the pipeline's request.

12 Mountain Valley itself has been very difficult to  
13 deal with. Again, I'm representing my son and his mother,  
14 who could not be here. But [Mountain Valley] has been on  
15 the property four times with no notice. They have given  
16 notice one time and didn't show. When they do come in for  
17 the survey, they kind of sneak in and they are not forthwith  
18 with the neighbors, and they have been difficult to deal  
19 with.

20 The interesting thing is, they come in for a  
21 survey, and this is a proposal that they've given my son.  
22 I'd like to highlight some of the things in the landowner  
23 questionnaire that they want us to fill out. They want us  
24 to tell 'em any existing wells within 150 feet of the limit  
25 of disturbance, which the well is, and that's something they

1 could certainly obtain from the survey.

2           They want the locations of septic systems.  
3 That's also within 150 feet of the LOD. Any structures,  
4 they're very obvious. There are two, the residence and an  
5 outbuilding, both modern. Any existing utilities, a power  
6 line goes over the proposed right-of-ways, and I know  
7 they're bringing in some big equipment and so it is amazing  
8 to me that someone would trespass at least four times on  
9 your property for the purposes of a survey, then ask you to  
10 fill out, go out and measure and see if you're within 100  
11 feet of this. I mean it just, you know, I've been around  
12 real estate, just to make real estate loans, and the survey  
13 is supposed to point those things out.

14           The jobs card, in my view, there are plenty of  
15 openings already around, and not enough good people to fill  
16 'em and I wanna thank you for this opportunity to present  
17 our points and your consideration of my points.

18           MR. RHUDY: My name is Alexander Rhudy. The  
19 pipeline proposed to cross my land at Mile Marker 253.1.  
20 And actually I met with the people in charge of acquiring  
21 right-of-ways today--they were on my property--and addressed  
22 some issues and one of the main concerns from the very  
23 beginning has been this Japanese Stiltgrass, which is the  
24 most invasive stuff I've ever seen in my life. But in  
25 reading the initial environmental study, one thing that I've

1 noticed that is pretty vague in it, is on the "restoring  
2 after the construction".

3           And they go into talking about what they're gonna  
4 do for the right-of-way. Well, they don't specify whether  
5 that's for the 50-foot wide permanent right-of-way, or does  
6 that include the 75-foot construction part of it also. From  
7 what I've read, that's very lacking. They just wanna let  
8 that 75 feet kind of go back to whatever it was before  
9 without a lot of effort being put into restoring it to some  
10 sustainable state.

11           And where it's crossing my land it's in the  
12 timber, and of course, that 75 foot is gonna take out a lot  
13 of large timber. And that needs to be reforested in some  
14 way. The Virginia Department of Forestry requires if I cut  
15 timber, I have to go back and replant timber. And I've done  
16 that on my property and other parts of it.

17           And so that 75-foot construction right-of-way  
18 needs to be addressed more specifically in the next  
19 Environmental Impact Statement because it's totally lacking  
20 in this one. And I've got a 600-and some page book right  
21 here beside of me that I've been reading. I've read over  
22 400 pages of it. And I haven't found anything that really  
23 is very specific.

24           There's a lot of foggy stuff in it. You're know,  
25 they're gonna plant some kind of wildlife mixture or native

1 plants. Well, what is that? You know, there's thirty-two  
2 invasive species listed in this book. And that are noxious.  
3 And so there's a lot lacking in detail in this assessment so  
4 far. So all of that needs to be specified so that me, as a  
5 landowner, that I feel like that my land is gonna be  
6 restored somewhat to a sustainable profitable position  
7 because I grow timber on this land, market timber on it.  
8 That's a really -- that and the wildlife habitat for hunting  
9 is the only reason I own the land.

10 I have a small cabin on it and I use it during  
11 hunting season and other times of the year, but it's mostly  
12 a place that I grow timber and provide habitat for wildlife  
13 where I hunt. So I hope they'll look at this very  
14 carefully. I didn't use my three minutes. So that's all I  
15 gotta say. No 30-second warning, right?

16 MS. COLLINS: My name is Frances Williams Doughty  
17 Collins. I'm from Newport, Virginia, Giles County. My  
18 property is located at Milepost 213. As a MVP pipeline  
19 opponent, I would like to cite several important and crucial  
20 items. I have a great concern for the contamination of my  
21 family's water supply of spring water, beautiful forest  
22 land, farm land and an early 1800s iron ore furnace that  
23 once provided employment for my neighbors.

24 MVP wants to destroy our late 1800s family farm,  
25 which has been passed down for five generations in Newport,

1 Virginia in Giles County. Why would you destroy this? I'm  
2 opposed to MVP survey which crosses over Canoe Cave on my  
3 Grandfather Doughty's farm in Giles County. This cave has a  
4 depth of about five to ten feet over three lakes that  
5 contain this distinct species of wildlife.

6 MVP surveyors have not considered the damage that  
7 a 42" pipeline would do to cropland, trees that took years  
8 to mature, structures that are essential for farming,  
9 springs that supply water to my great-grandfather's home.  
10 It doesn't take an expert to know that the Giles County area  
11 is full of karst topography and water flow through karst can  
12 be rapid and very unpredictable, which is a huge concern for  
13 me, as far as erosion is concerned. This in itself would  
14 cause irreparable harm to the springs and water supplies to  
15 my homes, to the local schools and to medical facilities.

16 The disturbance of slopes and mountains and  
17 contamination of water on my family's farm, as well as the  
18 Newport community, is unacceptable. How can FERC approve  
19 this as being safe and without contamination? The  
20 2,000-plus page EIS statement issued by FERC has a major  
21 concern. MVP stated that there would be a great impact on  
22 the national forests.

23 The national forests and Appalachian Trail have  
24 major concerns about crossing the AT near Peters Mountain in  
25 Giles County, because of the harm to habitat of sensitive

1 and animal species and ecosystems in the national forest.  
2 The AT has voiced concerns to FERC that MVP would have  
3 negative impact on the visual quality of the mountaintop and  
4 the recreational experience available to the public on the  
5 AT.

6 Another major concern is the effects of multiple  
7 pipeline crossing the AT and other scenic areas. Why would  
8 FERC approve MVP's application to destroy multiple  
9 forestland, farms, homes, historic buildings and historic  
10 communities so private companies can take people's private  
11 property for corporate gain. Please listen to the views of  
12 Ernst Kastning, an authority on karst terrain.

13 The construction of this pipeline through karst  
14 terrain is very hazardous, compounded by steep slopes, poor  
15 soils and other geohazards. MVP cannot safely build this  
16 line through our community. Please, FERC, reject this  
17 application of MVP to build this land and destroy our  
18 heritage in historic Newport, Virginia, Giles County.

19 MS. TRACY: My name is Patricia Tracy. I'm from  
20 Blacksburg. And what'd I like to say is very brief. This  
21 whole process is unbelievably corrupt. It is very clear to  
22 us that the FERC always approves pipelines. It's funded by  
23 the pipeline companies, supports the pipelines, is  
24 authorizing the theft of private property and I call that --  
25 and what it's doing to the citizens of this area, their



1 water, their property, their lives, their health, is in  
2 fact, domestic terrorism. Thank you.

3 MR. SCHNEIDER: Hi, good afternoon. My name's  
4 Paul Schneider. I'm an engineer for Roanoke Gas Company and  
5 I wanted to take a minute to explain why I support Mountain  
6 Valley Pipeline. I believe that this project will bring  
7 additional gas supply to Roanoke and the southwest Virginia  
8 region. The area is currently supplied by several natural  
9 gas pipelines, which have been operating safely for decades,  
10 and a third pipeline would provide opportunity to supply  
11 more people and businesses with safe natural gas service.

12 Another reason is for economic development. Many  
13 manufacturers in the area currently use natural gas and they  
14 are expanding due to the affordability and reliability of  
15 that service. And many other manufacturers that are moving  
16 to the area want to be able to use natural gas as well.

17 Another reason why I support the project is that  
18 it will help diversify energy options for people who live  
19 here and that they will be able to use natural gas to heat  
20 their homes and the manufacturers that move here will be  
21 able to create jobs, direct jobs in their industries, and  
22 periphery jobs supporting those industries. And that  
23 natural gas, a pipeline is statistically the safest way to  
24 transport fossil fuels from their source to use points.

25 And finally, the last reason and most personal

1 reason to me why I support natural gas is because they  
2 provide many good jobs. I know many people in the natural  
3 gas industry who have worked there for thirty-plus years,  
4 their entire careers. And I think this is a good  
5 opportunity for folks of all education levels to have good  
6 career-long jobs that can't be off-shored or sent somewhere  
7 else. Thank you.

8 MR. YOLTON: David Yolton. I'm opposed to the  
9 pipeline, mainly because of worry about our water sources in  
10 Giles County. We have many karst features, sinkholes, caves  
11 and that type of thing. Dye tracing has shown that we don't  
12 know where all the water goes. The pipeline is proposed to  
13 go through many sinkholes and near many caves. We are  
14 opposed to that.

15 I have a sheet here with scatter-shot thoughts  
16 that I picked up from the EIS. I noticed that the wells and  
17 springs have not all been located or tested. The pipeline  
18 is proposed to go through my property. My well has not been  
19 located or tested yet.

20 The erosion and sedimentation plan that is  
21 supposed to reduce downstream turbidity and sedimentation  
22 "should" reduce is not good enough term to use in  
23 constructing through such fragile terrain. I believe MVP  
24 should adhere to state soil and erosion control, not a  
25 special category.

1           The surveys for ten endangered species are not  
2 complete. Other surveys are incomplete. We've had numerous  
3 surveys on our property. We're given notice, but we don't  
4 know exactly when they're gonna come. They wanna come on  
5 November 9th and 10th. We do not know the reason for their  
6 return trip. It's very unnerving to have a group of  
7 strangers to come on your property.

8           We're opposed to the law that allows them to come  
9 on your property without your permission. We are opposed to  
10 the prospect of eminent domain by a private corporation for  
11 private gain. The karst topography, the Kastning Report  
12 which you all have, is a definitive study, although it's not  
13 referred in the EIS, nor refuted. This study concludes that  
14 the pipeline, if built where proposed, will cause  
15 unmitigable damage. And therefore, the EIS is wrong to  
16 state that negative effects can be mitigated. They cannot  
17 be mitigated.

18           The inspection of karst morphology is inadequate.  
19 Two years is not enough time to determine whether karst  
20 topography changes. We have a cave on our property at  
21 Milepost 210.4. The EIS says construction does not appear  
22 to encounter the cave, so they don't know whether they're  
23 encountering the cave.

24           We're extremely worried about the spillage of  
25 diesel, oils and other fluids that would get into the

1 groundwater. The proposed pipeline goes through historic  
2 properties. They're wrong on the historic properties  
3 identified. The EIS is incomplete, misleading, inaccurate  
4 and self-serving, and it's not sufficient for a "go-ahead"  
5 to construct the pipeline.

6           There needs to be a lot more work done and we  
7 believe that the route that they've chosen is wrong. It's  
8 not buildable. They've never built a pipeline of this size  
9 through our area before. We don't trust the procedure. We  
10 think that FERC is a rigged organization. They're funded by  
11 pipeline companies, oil and gas companies. They're immune  
12 or seemingly so to political expression. The demand has not  
13 been proven for the pipeline. The Key-Log economic report  
14 spells that out quite clearly that the demand is not there.  
15 The key observation points, the scar will appear along 460  
16 in Giles County, and we oppose it.

17           MS CISEK: I am Dawn Cisek, 402 Teele Acres Road,  
18 and that's Newport. I am here to oppose the pipeline and --  
19 how it affects my property is that they are taking a 40-foot  
20 right-of-way, which puts an access road right up against,  
21 within seven inches of my front porch, and so I would like  
22 that moved. But more importantly, my spring is gonna be  
23 affected, that's not on my property, it's on Mr. Jones'  
24 property, whom you will speak with soon.

25           They've made property deals with two of the other

1 neighbors who do not own the property where the spring is  
2 located, but not -- they haven't spoken with Mr. Jones, and  
3 if I lose that spring, I have no water. My house sits on a  
4 limestone cliff. I had to go through a lot of effort to  
5 purchase my home, which was built in 1880. It is on the  
6 historical district map.

7           And the only way I could get it was to do water  
8 testing, both on the purity of the water and the volume of  
9 the water. I have caves on my property. I have a huge  
10 sinkhole on my property. If they start getting up there,  
11 blasting -- I mean, common sense tells you water's gonna  
12 find the closest hole. So I'm very concerned about my  
13 water.

14           I'm very concerned about losing 100-year-old  
15 trees and an heirloom flower bed that may not mean anything  
16 to anybody else -- it means something to me. I'm very  
17 concerned about the division it's causing within our  
18 community of people who have sold their property and not  
19 sold. Both of my neighbors on either side have sold. It  
20 causes a problem. That's their prerogative.

21           I don't want them taking my property and  
22 affecting my way of life. That's my sense of place. It's  
23 not just a house. It's not -- I have to have water. And  
24 when I asked about the water before, they told me they would  
25 bring it in in a stainless-steel tank. I have a spring

1 that's been in my deed since 1880. And they're gonna  
2 replace it with a stainless-steel tank if my water goes  
3 away?

4 I don't understand how that can be. I don't  
5 understand having a pipeline coming through a historical  
6 district, the most populated area of Newport. It's coming  
7 right through the town. It's taking my parent's house. I  
8 think they just spoke with you. It's taking my parent's  
9 house. It's coming close to our, where our children play,  
10 where we worship. It's not a good thing.

11 It's just not a good thing, there's no good in  
12 this at all. And a real concern is, I don't understand how  
13 this is considered eminent domain. I understood eminent  
14 domain was supposed to be for the benefit of many. This is  
15 for a benefit of a rich fuel company. It's not benefiting  
16 us in any fashion. And that's all I have to say about that.

17 MS. COFFEY: Mary Beth Coffey. I'm a landowner  
18 at Milepost 243.5. How can I begin to respond to this draft  
19 Environmental Impact Statement? When the information  
20 contained within is incomplete, inadequate and inaccurate.  
21 I'll let MVP uncover and convey that missing information to  
22 you when you realize the shortcomings outlined in this faux  
23 environmental study.

24 Yes, MVP spokeswoman Natalie Cox said the draft  
25 was just that, a draft, and that we should accept gaps in

1 information. How can we be expected to voice concerns that  
2 are valid, but do not present because information is  
3 lacking?

4 I would, however, like to respond to some of the  
5 slipshod, careless, random and sketchy information that has  
6 been printed. All of the pristine Bent Mountain plateau is  
7 wetlands. The proposed pipeline would dog-leg through  
8 wetlands anywhere on the mountain. As a resident and  
9 frequent hiker on the mountain, I know these things.

10 As a matter of fact, MVP requests sitting the  
11 pipeline closer than 15 yards when paralleling certain  
12 waterbodies. Even FERC uses the delineation "not acceptable  
13 for pipelines being wider than acceptable right-of-way in  
14 some wetlands", which is yet another unacceptable proposal  
15 by MVP.

16 MVP merely mentions in Table 4.1, 1-10, that  
17 there are 4.3 miles of high incidence susceptibility to  
18 landslides in Roanoke County. Yet there are no milepost  
19 designations noted on the table as having areas of landslide  
20 concern. This is an error of contradiction that must be  
21 corrected.

22 Incomplete, also, is the recommended  
23 identification of all private, domestic water supply wells  
24 within 150 feet of the construction work areas. FERC highly  
25 "recommends" this assessment. A recommendation is

1 inadequate. And such identification should be required as  
2 all of the Bent Mountain residents, as well as many along  
3 the proposed pipeline path have private, natural water  
4 supplies.

5           The impacts on Bottom Creek, as well as the  
6 Spring Hollow reservoir, if this projected pipeline  
7 construction is approved, will have dire consequences on any  
8 and all living organisms unfortunate enough to be within its  
9 polluting commands.

10           The conclusions here are that the proposed  
11 pipeline project will be in solid violation of the Clean  
12 Water Act, and most importantly there will most certainly be  
13 long-term negative impacts on our waters. Water is life.

14           MR. DUDLEY: I'm Alden Dudley. I live here in  
15 southwest Roanoke County. I'm 79-year-old retired  
16 physician. I ran the laboratories in hospitals.  
17 Ironically, my dad worked for Mobil Oil from 1931 to '72 and  
18 was the person assigned to determine where the Colonial  
19 pipeline would go, from Houston, Texas up to Linden, New  
20 Jersey.

21           Sadly, that line is now 55-60 years old and is  
22 beginning to blow up every month or so. And so I've had a  
23 friendly awareness of pipelines and my three and a half  
24 acres happen to have an 8" East Tennessee gas line going  
25 across the back. I bought that without any real concern



1 because it was a small pipe and I thought everything would  
2 be fine.

3           Sadly I've learned, since the invasion of  
4 Mountain Valley Pipeline, about the hazards that they  
5 create. And the Trans-Alaska Pipeline is now leaking 500  
6 times a year. They record about forty, because they don't  
7 record them unless it's more than a barrel.

8           When you have crude oil kind of spittin' and  
9 sputterin' through a pinhole, it takes a long time for a  
10 barrel to come out. The snow turns black and they can see  
11 it and repair it before it gets to that size, so 90% of 'em  
12 don't ever get recorded as a leak.

13           It's an indication, however, that certainly the  
14 age of the pipeline is going to allow corrosion to create  
15 many, many, many pinholes, hundreds and actually thousands.  
16 And when you're talking natural gas, under a high pressure  
17 and get a pinhole, it's a totally different story. It's  
18 gonna come blasting through that hole and enlarge that hole  
19 and become a calamity very quickly.

20           I regret that not many people are alive and old  
21 enough to remember the natural gas explosion in Cleveland,  
22 Ohio, in 1944. At that time, natural gas was stored in  
23 tanks aboveground, like the tank farms that we see around  
24 this area for the trucks to drive up to. One of the tanks  
25 developed a leak around the well the natural gas came out.

1 It was cold so it went down to the ground, it found a sewer,  
2 went into the sewer, mixed with the gases in the sewer and  
3 then boom, there was an explosion blowing manhole covers off  
4 and they went as far as two miles away.

5           When the fire got back to the tank farm, it blew  
6 the adjoining tank up after several minutes, killing a bunch  
7 of people then. And that set off tanks 3 and 4.  
8 Fortunately, it was on Lake Erie, so half of the power went  
9 out over Lake Erie. The other half totally destroyed a  
10 square mile of the city of Cleveland, taking out seventy  
11 houses, two factories, killing 200 people, leaving 600  
12 people homeless, and the flash burns that went beyond that  
13 mile decimated all kinds of people and animals for quite  
14 some distance.

15           The calculated the power of that blast with an  
16 equivalent to one-sixth of the Nagasaki atomic bomb. And if  
17 you go on and create a utility corridor, one pipeline is  
18 gonna be calamitous enough. If you put Transco, who's  
19 already talking about co-laying a pipe with MVP, now, and if  
20 you have two pipes together, of course it's gonna be much  
21 worse.

22           Appomattox had a 30" pipe blow and it made a hole  
23 20 feet deep and 1,200 feet across. And that was eight  
24 years ago here in Virginia. When one of these pipes blows,  
25 it's gonna be 40 feet deep, half mile in diameter. For the

1 hole, all of that debris coming down somewhere, and then of  
2 course, the flash is going to set the forest ablaze for well  
3 over a mile in all directions.

4           The number of casualties is gonna be huge, just  
5 huge. And if it's near something like Smith Mountain Lake  
6 and the pipeline goes within two miles of the lake, it can  
7 blow out the dam, Leesville Lake dam, as well, others along  
8 the path. And the flooding, of course, is gonna be marked.

9           There is no way we will be able to get any profit  
10 from this pipeline passing through here to sell gas  
11 privately to Europe and India that will begin to pay for  
12 those kinds of expenses. And knowing that this can happen,  
13 the people that support it will be held accountable and you  
14 will see lawsuits as happened in California with the San  
15 Bruno fire, plus it's coming after the public officials, the  
16 commissions, everybody else to help recover the damages.  
17 And I don't think you want that. You really don't want  
18 that. Thank you very much.

19           MS. AUSTIN: Robin Austin. I'm talking to this  
20 from a personal level. It appears that our driveway, which  
21 is a shared driveway wants to be used as an access road.  
22 And I don't have any idea if any surveys have been done  
23 actually about what is along that road. We have a vernal  
24 pool, which I don't know if you know what a vernal pool is,  
25 but the vernal pool supports indicator species of water

1 quality and this is the only place these species can  
2 breathe. This is something I got off the internet. This is  
3 water from our vernal pool.

4           Also right there along the driveway, we have  
5 showy orchis, which is a native orchid, that we don't have  
6 everywhere, but it's very special to me, even though it is  
7 in Virginia. This is foliage from where the plant has  
8 already died back. And like I say, I don't know if anything  
9 has been done as far as a survey of anything along this  
10 driveway.

11           We host every year a hummingbird event. It's  
12 attended very strongly by members of the whole community,  
13 not just people on the mountain, but from everywhere. This  
14 is the one we did in 2012 where one of the people created  
15 this card for us as a thank you note, and as you can see, it  
16 showed bird feeders with many hummingbirds. We've had  
17 people come and actually record video, and there are  
18 estimates that we have at least 100 hummingbirds, at least.  
19 We feed a gallon and a half of sugar water every year  
20 between mid-July and mid-August and again, you know, it's  
21 the habitat, not just our little spot, but all around us  
22 that contributes to this.

23           So these are some of the things that I don't  
24 think that have been addressed. Also, we do have a well and  
25 a septic. And I don't know how much an access road would

1 impact us, but it could. We are very close to the blast  
2 zone. The pipeline crosses the road that we travel to and  
3 from to get to our home. It's going on the property that  
4 borders us. It's going along the edge of that. And then  
5 along the property behind us, so we're kind of surrounded by  
6 these pieces of the pipeline route.

7 I've been walking the pipeline with some of your  
8 surveyors. I've been on the property behind our house  
9 because the lady who had that property is not real  
10 comfortable in trying to communicate with the people of the  
11 pipeline. So we've been back there and I've been able to  
12 see things that I wouldn't've gotten to see.

13 One thing was a cemetery that has a person who  
14 was born in 1861 and died in 1899. That's within 400 meters  
15 of the center line. That's what the archeologist plotted  
16 out. It's just been very interesting to find what we do  
17 have in our community and a lot of this, literally in my  
18 backyard that I didn't even know about. So I don't know how  
19 much the surveyors have been there to see what is there,  
20 which is a concern of mine. That's probably my biggest  
21 concern right now.

22 But as I say, you know, I don't agree with the  
23 pipeline for the reasons of everybody else. I don't see the  
24 need. I don't agree with fracking. That's just not  
25 something I think is the right thing to do. And those are

1 my biggest concerns that I wanted to bring forth at this  
2 time. I've been doing comments on the site regularly.

3 MS. RIVES: My name is Mary Rives. What I want  
4 to say is that the water here is very important. So that's  
5 the crux of what I'm gonna talk about. The DEIS is so  
6 incomplete that I don't understand how MVP could even submit  
7 it. I feel like this meeting and this request for input is  
8 way too early in the process. We should be reviewing a  
9 draft that contains most, if not all of the information.

10 So now MVP is asking us to edit their report,  
11 write their report for 'em. I feel that's terribly wrong,  
12 and therefore, my comments are not gonna be very specific,  
13 because I'm not gonna write their report for 'em. So just  
14 take it from this that I have an advanced degree and I can't  
15 even make sense out of the report. So I only have reviewed  
16 part of the report because it's so thick, didn't have enough  
17 time, since I do have a life, that I only have addressed and  
18 looked at the part that has directly to do with my  
19 household.

20 The thing that concerns me is the water. And  
21 there are so many points that need to be made around the  
22 whole gamut of issues, that I don't have time to talk about  
23 'em, but with three minutes, I can talk about the water.  
24 Reference specifically Page 4-90. That's the area that  
25 talks about Bottom Creek, where I live, and the report.

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.

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

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.

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



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.

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.

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.

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  
14 emissions that are produced from the time this stuff is  
15 fracked out of the ground to burning.

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  
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  
22 evaluate the Hybrid Alternative 1A, which we were told is  
23 required by law and wasn't even discussed in the DEIS.

24           There are eight historic districts affected in  
25 Virginia that were also not covered in this DEIS. FERC's

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.

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  
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

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.

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.

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

1 just jump in.

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.

25           We also feel there has been incomplete

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.

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

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.

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.  
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



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.

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.

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

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.

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  
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

1 impact.

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  
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.

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

1 the viewshed as well.

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.

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  
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.

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

1 to make your millions. Thank you.

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  
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

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?

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.

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.

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



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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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 --

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.



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.

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.

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.

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

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  
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?

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

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.

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

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.

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

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

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.

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

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

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,  
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.

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

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.

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



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.

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

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.

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  
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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.



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

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.

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  
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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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 flawed 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.

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.

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

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.

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

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  
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.

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?

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

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.

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.



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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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



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 displacement 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

1 by limited emergency response capability. We already know  
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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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?

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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  
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,

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  
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



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.

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.

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.

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.

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  
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 think 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  
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

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.

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.

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.

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,  
7 with the steep terrain that has not been properly surveyed,  
8 I worry about additional erosion.

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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

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?

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  
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  
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  
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

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 eminent 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

## 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