

Evelyn Tidlow

From: Centofanti, John <JCentofanti@eqt.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2018 12:01 PM
To: Richard Chidester; John Ross
Cc: Evelyn Tidlow; Justin Curtis
Subject: MVP Responses to Giles County Questions

Gentlemen – please find responses below to the two remaining questions from our meeting last week:

- A. MVP to provide County with correspondence with the SHPO and other relevant documentation regarding location and identification of resources in Giles County (*provided January 16*)
- B. MVP to provide County with additional information on agricultural practices that will be allowed or prohibited in the right of way and a summary of how such information is provided to current and future landowner

Response

MVP will utilize minimum Class 2 pipe in areas of karst, including Giles County, VA, which will withstand greater stress should a sinkhole develop under the pipe. MVP hired a consultant, D.G. Honegger Consulting, that specializes in constructing pipelines in areas with potential external forces, to perform an analysis of potential karst construction methods of the Project. The results of this analysis documented that class 2 pipe buried with a normal depth of cover of 3 feet could tolerate a sinkhole span of 145 feet, and if buried at an abnormal depth of cover of 10 feet, could tolerate a sinkhole span of 57 feet.

MVP is designed to accommodate a piece of farm equipment at 40,000 lbs. in agriculture areas. In instances where a landowner requires a crossing of greater than 40,000 lbs., the MVP Land team will work with the landowner and the MVP Engineering team in order to determine the proper engineering considerations to accommodate the specific landowner request. Engineering considerations at specific crossings could include items such as timber mats, additional gravel, air bridge, concrete, etc. There are too many variables beyond the weight of the equipment to be able to provide a blanket approval greater than the 40,000 lbs. In each particular case items such as the PHSMA class location (design factor), weight distribution of the requested piece of equipment (tracked vs. rubber tire, number of axles, etc.), permanent vs. temporary crossing, soil conditions, and installed pipeline depth of cover are considered as part of the engineering evaluation.

There are several examples along the MVP route where landowner requests for crossings greater than 40,000 lbs. have been accommodated. Specifically, in Giles County, there have been at least four examples where MVP has worked with the landowners to allow site specific crossings ranging from 60,000 to 100,000 lbs. It is imperative that landowners communicate potential crossing locations with the MVP Land team. The site specific designs of these crossings are critical to ensure pipeline integrity due to point loading on the pipe, increased soil compaction, and protection of environmental resources.

- C. MVP to provide County with additional information regarding the possibility of future pipelines being co-located in the existing right of way

Response

In our discussion last Friday, you asked for additional information about the possibility of future pipelines being sited within existing right of way. You referred to language in an easement agreement you had reviewed which granted MVP the right to site an additional pipeline within the right of way on the property.

Following our call, I reached out to our land department to get further information on the easement provision you referenced. I've been informed that the referenced provision is boilerplate and is included in MVP/EQT's standard land agreements. It does not indicate any plan or proposal to add a second pipeline to the right of way. The purpose of this standard language is simply to allow MVP to avoid having to renegotiate its existing easements in the event it were to decide, at a future date, to seek approval to co-locate a section of a new pipeline within one of its existing easements. To reiterate, MVP has not proposed to add a second pipeline to the existing right of way through Giles County.

The easement provision does not give MVP any right, authorization, or shortcut for the construction of any hypothetical future pipeline. Any future pipelines, whether or not they share an existing right of way, would have to through the process of obtaining all necessary federal and state approvals.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,

John

*John J. Centofanti
Corporate Director, Environmental Affairs
EQT Corporation
625 Liberty Avenue, Suite 1700
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
412-395-3305 (office)
412-417-3729 (cell)*

To learn about EQT's sustainability efforts visit: <https://csr.eqt.com>