



625 Liberty Avenue, Suite 1700 | Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
844-MVP-TALK | mail@mountainvalleypipeline.info  
www.mountainvalleypipeline.info

June 30, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC  
Docket No. PF15-3-000  
**RESPONSE TO SCOPING COMMENTS**

Dear Ms. Bose:

Pursuant to Section 157.21(f)(9) of the Commission's rules and regulations, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC is hereby submitting for filing in the captioned proceeding its response to the scoping comments that were submitted in the captioned proceeding through June 16, 2015.

A copy of this filing is also being provided to Paul Friedman, OEP and to Lavinia DiSanto, Cardno. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned by telephone at (412) 395-5540 or by e-mail at pdiehl@eqt.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul W. Diehl".

Paul W. Diehl

Enclosures

cc: Paul Friedman (w/enclosures)  
Lavinia M. DiSanto, Cardno, Inc. (w/enclosures)

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Scoping Process</i>				
1	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Participation in Project review	Not Addressed (NA)	MVP appreciates that EPA will participate in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) review process.
2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Recommends engagement with US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and EPA regarding implementation of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Section 404 permit is required to authorize the discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters of the U.S.	NA	MVP has begun discussions with USACE and EPA regarding the CWA Section 404 permit.
3	U.S. Forest Service	Participation in Project review	NA	MVP appreciates that the US Forest Service will participate in the FERC review process.
4	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Participation in Project review	NA	MVP appreciates that the USACE will participate in the FERC review process.
5	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Need for USACE permits	NA	MVP plans to submit complete permit applications for USACE permits.
6	Congressmen H. Morgan Griffith and Bob Goodlatte Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Preserve Craig County Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Franklin Multiple Individuals	Request for additional public scoping meeting	NA	In letters dated June 18, 2015, FERC advised interested parties that it did not intend to extend the formal scoping period, but noted it would continue to consider comments that were submitted throughout the review period. Those letters also provided general information about the scope of future activities related to the environmental process.
7	U.S. Senator Mark R. Warner Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Craig County Board of Supervisors Giles County Board of Supervisors Monroe County Commission Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Preserve Craig County Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Roanoke Appalachian Voices Multiple Individuals	Request to extend scoping period by 90 days	NA	In letters dated June 18, 2015, FERC advised interested parties that it did not intend to extend the formal scoping period, but noted it would continue to consider comments that were submitted throughout the review period. Those letters also provided general information about the scope of future activities related to the environmental process.
8	Stockbridge-Munsee Tribal Historic Preservation Office	Not within Mohican area of interest	NA	Thank you for your response. MVP will update its records accordingly.
9	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ)	Instruction for submittal of EIS to VDEQ for review	NA	MVP appreciates the input by VDEQ and has been utilizing, or plans to utilize the various databases and coordinate with the Virginia agencies as appropriate.
10	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP)	Need for WVDEP permits/certifications including: - State Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification - Oil and Gas Construction Stormwater Permit - Hydrostatic Testing Discharge Permit - Industrial Stormwater Discharge Permit - Air Preconstruction Permit - Underground Injection Control for stormwater in karst areas	NA	MVP plans to pursue all applicable West Virginia permits. MVP's application to FERC will provide additional information about the status of the relevant permits.
11	Multiple Individuals	Request that an EIS be prepared for all alternatives	NA	MVP has provided information for alternatives in draft Resource Report 10 and will continue to evaluate alternatives and provide information in final Resource Report 10 included with its application to FERC.

<sup>1</sup> Numerous agencies, organizations, and/or individuals made similar comments and were grouped accordingly to avoid repetition in this table. Additional agencies, organizations, and/or individuals may not all be listed; however, all relevant issues of concerns have been identified. In addition, certain individuals have raised concerns about impacts on specific features (such as caves, streams, sinkholes, etc.) that may be present on their property; MVP will address these features in the final design after civil and environmental surveys are complete.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
12	Natural Resources Defense Council Greenbrier River Watershed Association Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Wild Virginia Additional Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) Multiple Individuals	Request that a Programmatic EIS be prepared to evaluate the impacts of all pipeline projects within the region	NA	The decision to consider a programmatic EIS for all pipeline projects within the region resides with FERC. However, a programmatic EIS is not necessary or appropriate to evaluate the Project. With the exception of the Equitrans Expansion Project (Docket No. PF15-22), which will be considered in the same EIS as MVP, MVP and other pipeline projects in the region are not connected or cumulative actions. MVP is not dependent upon, and does not trigger, those other pipeline projects. The Project is market-driven and could proceed on its own, regardless of whether any other pipeline project is certificated.  FERC has discretion whether to analyze similar actions in the same EIS. MVP and the other pipeline projects in the region are not similar actions because of the different purposes and needs for the projects and the disparity in geography and time. MVP serves different end points and markets as compared to the other reasonably foreseeable pipeline projects in the region. There is no basis for FERC to evaluate the environmental impacts for such fact-intensive projects in a single programmatic EIS. Further, a programmatic EIS would not assist FERC in meeting its obligations under NEPA.
<i>Project Description; Purpose and Need</i>				
13	Washington Gas Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce Multiple Individuals	Support for the Project due to economic gains.	NA	Thank you for your support. MVP agrees that the Project will provide economic benefits. MVP will further discuss such economic benefits in its application to FERC.
14	Multiple Individuals	Complaints about MVP being evasive and dishonest in responding to questions during scoping period and open houses	NA	MVP has made a good faith effort to provide open, honest, and transparent communications to all stakeholders who may have an interest in or be impacted by the Project. Additionally, the project team has been dedicated to providing accurate responses to questions and comments made during the scoping process, as well as during open houses and individual meetings with local officials and landowners along the proposed and alternate routes. The scoping process occurs early in the project planning phase, when many Project details are not yet fully defined; therefore, specific and detailed answers to some questions are not yet available. These circumstances may contribute to the perception that some of MVP's responses are incomplete.
15	Natural Resources Defense Council Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Cahas Mountain Preservation Society Preserve Greenbrier County Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Potential to increase hydraulic fracturing activities	NA	The MVP Project is a natural gas transmission project. Natural gas production, including hydraulic fracturing, is outside the scope of FERC's jurisdiction and of the MVP Project. NEPA does not require FERC to review impacts that are not causally related to the proposed project or reasonably foreseeable. The impacts of natural gas production are not generally considered by FERC in its assessment of natural gas pipeline projects. The impacts from the exploration, drilling, and processing of natural gas should not be considered here because the timing of such development is uncertain, the activities involve different types of physical processes, and the production and processing of natural gas prior to shipment in a pipeline is regulated separately by federal, state, and local regulations. In addition, it is not possible to foresee the precise natural gas supplies that will be transported by the Project because it is not possible to trace back each molecule of gas to its source. Further, FERC has consistently and repeatedly found in prior orders that "there is no Commission plan or policy to promote the unconventional production of, or to increase reliance on, natural gas." See <i>Rockies Express Pipeline LLC</i> , 150 FERC ¶ 61,161 at P 54 (2015). Therefore, consistent with its precedent, FERC is not required to consider the effects of natural gas production in its NEPA analysis for the Project. See, e.g., <i>Constitution Pipeline Co., LLC</i> , 149 FERC ¶ 61,199 (2014); <i>Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., L.L.C.</i> , 142 FERC ¶ 61,025 at PP 79-87 (2012). Accordingly, MVP will not address natural gas production activities in its application to FERC.
16	Wild Virginia Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League Preserve the New River Valley Multiple Individuals	Project is meant for export of gas overseas	Resource Report 1, Section 1.1	The natural gas transported via the Project would: (1) support demand growth in the Mid-Atlantic, the Southeast, and Appalachian regions resulting from increased gas usage for power generation, economic development, and residential customer growth; (2) replace natural gas supplies from the Gulf Coast that have historically supplied the Mid-Atlantic and Southeast because Gulf Coast gas would likely stay in the Gulf Coast region and not be delivered to the Northeast due to growing natural gas demand in that region from the petrochemical industry; and (3) supply markets along the pipeline in West Virginia and Virginia that are either underserved by natural gas or would be developed as a result of increased natural gas availability. Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) (15 United States Code [USC] § 717b) prohibits the import or export of natural gas from or to a foreign country without prior approval from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Parties who want to enter into natural gas transactions with foreign sellers and buyers must file for an export authorization under the rules and procedures found in DOE's regulations. MVP does not plan to file for this authorization. Further, MVP does not own title to the natural gas that would be transported and; therefore, has no control over the ultimate destination of the product.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
17	Natural Resources Defense Council Preserve Monroe Greenbrier River Watershed Association Chesapeake Climate Action Network Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Roanoke Wild Virginia Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV New River Conservancy Cahas Mountain Preservation Society Green Party of Virginia Preserve Greenbrier County Multiple Individuals	Justification for Project (purpose and need) Request for an assessment of the U.S. market demand for natural gas and an evaluation of the existing pipelines for meeting that demand	Resource Report 1,  <i>Additional information will be included with application to FERC</i>	MVP has provided an overview of the Project purpose and need in draft Resource Report 1. Additional information, including market analysis, will be included with MVP's application to FERC.  A study by the Advanced Energy Economy Institute (AEEI) titled "Impacts of the Clean Power Plan on U.S. Natural Gas Markets and Pipeline Infrastructure" was released in June 2015. The study states "Even without the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan, ongoing changes in the U.S. natural gas market will require billions of dollars for new pipeline infrastructure over the next 15 years. About 70% of the projected infrastructure needed is already in the planning stage, prompted by dramatic growth in new gas supplies from areas like the Marcellus and Utica shales."  With its connection to the existing Equitrans system in West Virginia, the Project is specifically designed to address infrastructure constraints associated with the rapid development of natural gas from the Marcellus and Utica shale plays, while more importantly offering critical supply diversity to meet the increasing demand for natural gas across the Southeast. The Project is fully subscribed and has secured commitments at 20-year terms for its minimum capacity amount of 2 Bcf per day of firm transmission capacity. Having WGL Midstream as a purchaser and a shipper with Mountain Valley Pipeline reinforces the need for this project as their agreement helps to address the growing transportation constraints facing natural gas producers and, more importantly, helps WGL to offer critical supply diversity to meet the increasing demand for natural gas in the mid-Atlantic region and Southeast markets. WGL has a major presence in this regional market and currently moves significant volume on Transco's mainline; therefore, securing them as a joint venture partner validates the market's need for additional energy supply sources at station 165 – and also reaffirms MVP's commitment to provide a safe, reliable supply of Appalachian-produced natural gas to regional markets in the mid-Atlantic and Southeast United States.
18	Multiple Individuals	Release of confidential information regarding contracted shippers and receivers for the Project	FERC application	MVP will provide information regarding the contracts to FERC as part of its certificate application.
19	County Commission of Summers County Multiple Individuals	Lack of direct benefit to local communities (minimal jobs, no direct connection to natural gas) Question accuracy of estimated ad valorem taxes	Resource Report 1, Section 1.1; Resource Report 5, Introduction and Section 5.3.2.1	Draft Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2.1 states that MVP estimates that it will spend approximately \$1.1 billion on labor, equipment, materials, and services in West Virginia (\$712 million) and Virginia (\$396 million) during Project construction, with an additional \$2.2 billion spent outside these states. These expenditures would generate economic activity and support employment and income elsewhere in the economy. In addition, MVP would provide additional tax base for the communities crossed by the pipeline. Tax benefits are discussed in draft Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.7.  As stated in the Introduction to draft Resource Report 5, construction of the Project is estimated to create 4,000-5,000 temporary construction jobs of which 10% are anticipated from local resources. Operation of the Project would generate 25 new jobs.  As stated in draft Resource Report 1, Section 1.1, the Project will be an interstate "open access" transmission pipeline, and as such, parties seeking to ship natural gas and parties seeking to receive natural gas have a right to access the pipeline. As a transmission pipeline, it will be necessary for MVP to work with the local distribution companies (LDCs) to ultimately provide gas service to communities along the route. In Virginia, for example, the Virginia State Corporation Commission regulates natural gas LDCs and establishes service territories for these companies. As these LDCs have the authority to provide natural gas service, MVP is working with these companies to explore the feasibility of providing gas service along the route. MVP has been working closely with the localities and industrial end users, as well as with LDCs, in both West Virginia and Virginia, to develop a service solution for the customer through the Project development phase of the proposed pipeline. MVP will continue to work with these entities throughout development of the Project.
20	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Potential to increase co-location with existing utility and/or transportation ROWs to avoid greenfield construction	Resource Report 10, Sections 10.5.1, 10.5.2, 10.5.6, 10.6	Co-location with existing utility and transportation corridors was a factor in the design and routing of the MVP pipeline and is discussed in draft Resource Report 10. Consideration of co-location during the initial pipeline routing is discussed in Section 10.5.1 in draft Resource Report 10, co-location is further evaluated for each pipeline alternative discussed in Section 10.5.2 through 10.5.6 in draft Resource Report 10, and for each pipeline variation in Section 10.6 in draft Resource Report 10. MVP will continue to evaluate the potential to increase co-location as additional pipeline alternatives are identified. MVP will include its final analysis in its application to FERC.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
21	Multiple Individuals Greenbrier River Watershed Association	What is the estimated total cost to EQT/MVP and their corporate partners in constructing the pipeline? What are the estimated outgoing costs of the continued operation of the pipeline throughout its productive life? What is the projected total profit to EQT/MVP and their shareholders (a cost that will ultimately be borne by the public as it pays the commodity price for the gas the pipeline transports)?	Resource Report 5	MVP has consistently stated the total cost of the project to be an estimated \$3.2 - \$3.5 billion and have communicated this cost range via news releases, website updates, and during open houses and scoping meetings. MVP will include the estimated capital, operation and maintenance, and other costs for the Project in its application to FERC. However, due to market competition, details of the project-specific annual costs and any related economics are proprietary and confidential in nature. MVP cannot comment on commodity price impact as that will ultimately be determined by the market area demand and supply specifics. Additional regional natural gas supply as a result of Project development should ultimately lower the regional commodity price, which should support consumer cost savings. The recourse rates in the application will include a rate of return on equity component for MVP.
22	Multiple Individuals	Project lifespan Plan for abandonment of facilities including details on how the abandoned pipeline would be monitored for structural integrity to make sure that geological factures (karst) do not result in pipeline surfacing aboveground	Resource Report 1	MVP currently has no plans for abandonment of the facilities. However, at the end of the useful life of the Project MVP will obtain the necessary legal approvals to abandon its facilities, and that permission could include the requirement for plans for either removal of the buried pipeline or monitoring if the pipeline were abandoned in-place.
23	Multiple Individuals	Quality of fracked gas, potential presence of liquids in the natural gas		MVP will transport what is known as "transmission quality" natural gas. MVP's FERC Gas Tariff will include a section on gas quality. Most liquid constituents will be removed by others, prior to the natural gas entering the pipeline.
<i>Alternatives</i>				
24	Wild Virginia Appalachian Voices Multiple Individuals	Renewable energy (solar or wind) or energy conservation efforts as alternatives Clarification of statement in Resource Report 10 ("Nuclear energy is not an option for home heating")	Resource Report 10, Section 10.3	The alternatives analysis has been updated to include evaluation of renewable and other energy alternatives, as addressed in Section 10.3 in draft Resource Report 10. The referenced statement about nuclear energy is in reference to direct supply for home heating (in comparison to natural gas which can be delivered directly to homes). MVP acknowledges that nuclear power stations provide electricity for many homes, including homes with electric heat.
25	Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Multiple Individuals	Use of rail transport as an alternative method to transport natural gas as this would offer greater flexibility, make use of existing infrastructure and provide more permanent employment than construction of a pipeline	<i>Will be added to Final RR10</i>	Such an alternative would require natural gas to first be liquefied (liquefied natural gas or LNG) and then transported as a liquid. This would require new liquefaction facilities near the source of natural gas, and new re-vaporization facilities near the end user. Therefore, because of the proximity required to these facilities, this would not offer greater flexibility than the MVP Project. In addition, transportation of natural gas by pipeline is safer than transportation by rail.
26	West Virginia Scenic Trails Association Craig County Commission Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Commonwealth of Virginia, DCR, Division of Natural Heritage Multiple Individuals	Concerns about specific pipeline route alternatives identified in MVP's draft RR1 filed 12/1/14 and Alternatives Update filed 2/18/15. Specific concerns along pipeline alternatives include safety, steep terrain, karst geology, water supplies, rare species, public lands, proximity to residences, visual impacts, and impact on community character.	Resource Report 10, Section 10.4, 10.5, and 10.6, <i>Updates will be added to Final RR10</i>	MVP acknowledges the concerns identified along the identified pipeline alternatives. Concerns identified to date are discussed under the appropriate pipeline alternatives in Sections 10.5 and 10.6 of draft Resource Report 10, and MVP will update the analysis of each alternative with information provided in comments and identified through other sources during the scoping process. Updated analyses of specific pipeline alternatives will be included in final Resource Report 10 with MVP's application to FERC. MVP notes that similar concerns have been identified along some segments of the proposed route, and for each pipeline alternative considered, the determination of the preferred route will be based on comparison of impacts with the corresponding segment of proposed route.
27	Preserve Craig County Craig County Commission Monroe County Commission Multiple Individuals	Concern that landowners and communities along pipeline alternatives identified in the February 18, 2015 Alternatives Update have not had adequate time to review and comment. Request for additional Open Houses.	Resource Report 10, Sections 10.6.4, 10.6.5, and 10.6.6	MVP identified new alternative pipeline routes as a result of ongoing field work and issues raised during early public outreach, and attempted to make these pipeline alternatives known to FERC and the public as soon as reasonable during the FERC pre-filing process. New alternatives were made public in February 2015 prior to FERC issuing its Notice of Intent and prior to start of formal scoping, and prior to submittal of the draft Resource Report 10 in April 2015. MVP notified landowners crossed by the alternative routes, and held additional Open Houses along alternative pipeline routes on April 6 and 7, 2015. Further, as noted earlier in response to Issue 6, FERC has advised interested parties that it does not intend to extend the formal scoping period.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Waterbodies Crossed</i>				
28	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest WVDNR West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection VDCR DNH Montgomery County Board of Supervisors County Commission of Summers County Big Bend Public Service District Greenbrier River Watershed Association Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Trout Unlimited Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter West Virginia Rivers Coalition Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Identification of all named and unnamed waterbodies that will be crossed by the pipeline and identification of proposed crossing methods This should include identification of any federally or state designated waterbodies (including Tier III waters, impaired streams, etc.) as well as identification of aquifers, springs, etc.  Specific concerns about crossing of the Greenbrier River at Pence Springs (Big Bend PSD Zone of Critical Concern ), North Fork of the Roanoke River, Gauley River, Little Creek, Teels Creek, Magadee Creek, Blackwater River, Mill Creek, Bradshaw Creek, Back Creek, Wold Creek, Indian Creek, Potts Creek, and any Class/Tier III Wild Trout Water streams  VDCR DNH identified Planning and Recreational Resources (PRR) waters that could potentially be impacted by the Project including: Sinking Creek; Roanoke River; Craig Creek; Blackwater River; Pig River & water trail	Resource Report 2, Sections 2.2.2.2 and 2.2.4	MVP is currently conducting field surveys to identify waterbodies that will be crossed by the pipeline route. These surveys will be followed with site-specific analysis on the appropriate crossing method for each waterbody crossed. Crossing methods could include open-cut and bores (horizontal directional drillings (HDD) or conventional). Temporary equipment crossings of the stream may be necessary during construction. MVP will attempt to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies during the routing process. Best management practices and minimal impact crossing techniques will be employed when crossing streams. Waterbody crossing techniques are reviewed and approved by agencies prior to construction and are used to avoid or minimize direct impacts. Following construction disturbed stream and riparian areas will be reestablished and replanted in accordance with permit conditions and the FERC Wetland and Waterbody Construction & Mitigation Procedures (Procedures). MVP is working closely with the Wildlife Habitat Council in addition to regulatory agencies to successfully restore native riparian habitats after construction to the greatest extent practicable.  Most recreational activities on waterbodies will not be impacted during construction outside of the immediate crossing location. Should recreational activities such as boating or canoeing be affected by construction, it will be temporary in nature and proper notice will be given to the public prior to the start of construction in that area.
29	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency West Virginia Division of Natural Resources (WVDNR) Trout Unlimited	Identification of any affected water resource that is (or is located within) a state or federally designated outstanding waters, designated wildlife management area, state or federal park, or other similar designation, pristine water resource, etc. Alternative routes should avoid special protection areas and high functioning or high quality and rare systems Recommend that HDD should be used to avoid critical aquatic resources if crossing is unavoidable	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.2	MVP has performed an initial review of surface waters in draft Resource Report 2 where sensitive waterbodies specifically are discussed in Section 2.2.2 for the proposed route. MVP is currently conducting field surveys to identify waterbodies that will be crossed by the pipeline, including any special designation for the waterbodies. MVP will evaluate alternative routes or crossing methods for specially designated waterbodies and implement them to the extent practicable. This process will continue throughout the FERC and respective state permitting processes.
30	Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter	Identification of any Wild and Scenic Rivers potentially impacted by the Project	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.1	MVP has performed an initial review of surface waters in draft Resource Report 2 where national and state wild and scenic rivers specifically are discussed in Section 2.2.1 for the proposed route. MVP has identified four potential federal waterbodies and five state-designated waterbodies proposed to be crossed as discussed in the draft resource report. MVP is currently conducting field surveys to evaluate these waterbodies.
31	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Adverse impacts to streams and wetlands must be avoided to the maximum extent practicable	Resource Report 2, Sections 2.2, 2.3, and 2.1.4	MVP will avoid adverse impacts to streams and wetlands to the extent practicable. Measures to avoid or minimize impacts will be described in Resource Report 2 filed as part of MVP's application to FERC.
32	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Multiple Individuals	Identification of any affected water resources that are listed on the CWA Section 303(d) impaired water list and if any potential impacts are expected on the affected water resource's Total Maximum Daily Load status	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.5	MVP has performed an initial review of surface waters in draft Resource Report 2 where contaminated sediments and impaired waters specifically are discussed in Section 2.2.5 for the proposed route. MVP is currently conducting field surveys to identify waterbodies that will be crossed by the pipeline, including any water resources that are listed on the CWA Section 303(d) impaired water list. MVP will evaluate if potential impacts are expected on the Total Maximum Daily Load status of the impaired waters proposed to be crossed in Resource Report 2 filed as part of MVP's application to FERC.
33	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency WVDNR Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Trout Unlimited Wild Virginia New River Conservancy	Source of hydrostatic testing water and the potential for introducing contaminations upstream of and affect drinking water intakes during return of testing water	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.3	MVP provided initial information on hydrostatic test water in draft Resource Report 2, and continues to evaluate potential source and discharge locations for hydrostatic test water and possible impacts to drinking water sources. This information will be included in Resource Report 2 filed as part of MVP's application to FERC. MVP will also be coordinating with and applying for the proper permits for hydrostatic discharge from WVDEP and VDEQ.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Erosion and Sediment Control</i>				
34	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR), Division of Natural History (DNH) Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association Indian Creek Watershed Association Greenbrier River Watershed Association Preserve Craig Preserve Roanoke Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Trout Unlimited Wild Virginia Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV New River Conservancy Multiple Individuals	Control of erosion and sediment due to construction, especially blasting through rock, and associated impacts to water quality Stormwater management Development of a spill plan	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.4	Section 2.2.4 in draft Resource Report 2 addresses measures that MVP will implement to protect water resources from the potential effects of sedimentation during construction and operation of the Project. MVP will implement the erosion control measures specified in the Project's Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (E&SCP) and the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation & Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Procedures along with any Construction Stormwater Permits to minimize erosion and for stormwater management during construction and operation of the facilities. MVP will also develop a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan that will address procedures to be followed in the case of an inadvertent release of hazardous materials. This plan will be provided in MVP's application to the FERC.  MVP will continue to consult with state agencies during the permitting process to identify additional site-specific mitigation measures.
35	Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Roanoke County Board of Supervisors	Impacts to water quality in Higginbotham property due to increased silt and sediment from construction	Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.4	MVP will attempt to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive streams and waterbodies during the routing process on all properties. The use of best management practices will maintain the designated water quality. MVP plans to construct and restore these areas in accordance with the rules and regulations of regulatory agencies. In addition, MVP will implement the erosion control measures specified in the Project's E&SCP and the FERC Plan and Procedures along with any Construction Stormwater Permits to minimize erosion and for stormwater management during construction and operation of the facilities to further mitigate potential impacts on these resources.
36	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Proposed mitigation of impacts to wetlands	Resource Report 2, Section 2.3	MVP is currently conducting field surveys to identify wetlands that are proposed to be crossed by the pipeline. MVP provided initial information on wetland impacts and proposed measures to mitigate those impacts in draft Resource Report 2. Information from field surveys will be included in Resource Report 2 filed as part of MVP's application to FERC. If necessary, mitigation of wetland impacts will be coordinated and approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers.
37	Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association Greenbrier River Watershed Association Multiple Individuals	Impacts to wetlands Specific concerns with regards to wetlands, including at the following locations: - Blue Ridge Land Conservancy's Higginbotham property - Coal Bank Ridge Development - Near crossing of Bottom Creek - At crossing of Iron Ridge Road - At intersection of Batts Road and Coal Bank Hollow Road in Sinking Creek Valley	Resource Report 2, Section 2.3.4	MVP is currently performing field surveys to evaluate potential impacts to wetlands. MVP will attempt to avoid wetland impacts to the extent practicable. If wetlands cannot be avoided, MVP will consider construction methods to minimize impacts (See Section 2.3.4 of draft Resource Report 2). MVP will continue to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as well as state agencies, in accordance with Clean Water Act 401 and 404 permitting to minimize and mitigate potential impacts to wetlands. MVP will also adhere to the measures in the FERC Plan and Procedures to restore all habitats (including wetlands), as near as practicable to their original condition. MVP will have a project-specific E&SCP to protect wetland resources, and has also partnered with the Wildlife Habitat Council to make recommendations for habitat restoration enhancement. MVP is working closely with the Wildlife Habitat Council in addition to regulatory agencies to successfully restore native wetland habitats after construction to the greatest extent practicable.  Specific concerns with identified wetlands will be addressed in the final design after civil and environmental surveys are complete.
<i>Monitoring Water Quality; Spill Response</i>				
38	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest	Identification of whether acid-producing rock will be disturbed/exposed realizing acid runoff/drainage during construction, and identification of water quality impacts associated with existing available treatment methodologies	Resource Report 2, Section 2.1.1.2	Rocks that might potentially produce acidic conditions in the environment are discussed in Section 2.1.1.2. MVP will develop and implement its own Project-specific E&SCP that will outline best management practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize impacts from construction disturbance of potential acid-producing rock. Water treatment is not expected to be necessary due to the limited extent of such disturbances and the implementation of stormwater and erosion controls.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
39	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Craig County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Monroe County Commission Greenbrier County Board of Health Greenbrier River Watershed Association Big Bend Public Service District Indian Creek Watershed Association Preserve Monroe Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Preserve Roanoke Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV New River Conservancy Red Sulphur Public Service District Smith Mountain Lake Association New River Valley Regional Commission Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Impacts to public and private, including agricultural, water supplies Monitoring of private and public water supplies (pre- and post-construction), including wells Cost of repair or reparation for damages to private and public water resources Impacts to public water supplies including all Public Services Districts (PSDs) Specific concerns with regards to Red Sulphur and Big Bend PSDs, and Roanoke County, Peters Mountain Springs, New River, Cherrystone Creek, and Smith Mountain Lake water resources	Resource Report 2, Sections 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, 2.1.3.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.2.4 and 2.2.4	<p>MVP will attempt to avoid water sources identified during the pre-construction phase of the pipeline. Private groundwater supplies are discussed in Sections 2.1.3.2 and 2.1.3.3 in draft Resource Report 2. MVP will conduct surveys to identify private wells and springs within 150 feet of the construction work area. As stated in Sections 2.1.3.2 and 2.1.4 in draft Resource Report 2, wells within 150 feet of the construction work area will be staked and flagged for visibility, and surrounded with silt fence and safety fence. Private groundwater wells and municipal water supplies will be identified and verified by affected landowners/stakeholders prior to construction. Additionally, with landowner permission, MVP will conduct and document water quality testing of wells and springs within 150 feet of the edge of the construction work area. Some wells and spring supplies, based on direction, location, and hydrogeologic setting, may also be selected for yield testing. MVP will document any landowner choosing to opt out of pre-construction evaluation. Landowners participating in the testing program will be contacted by a MVP representative, and a qualified independent contractor will perform the testing.</p> <p>Construction processes may temporarily alter springs, bogs or natural seeps. MVP will survey the areas of concern prior to construction and will use best management practices and construction techniques to minimize impacts to a particular water source. Best management practices may include the following options: sealing the trench in these specific areas to prevent drainage of the water source away from the trench line, installation of perforated flexible tubing to maintain drainage, and where necessary a hydrogeologist or geofluvialmorphologist may evaluate the water source and provide a site-specific design to prevent or minimize impacts. Additional BMPs would include restrictions of refueling activities as specified in a SPCC Plan. There are no liquids in the pipeline that would be released to groundwater or surface water and in the unlikely event of a leak or breach in the pipeline, the natural gas (which is lighter than air) will rise to the ground surface and dissipate in the air.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 2.1.3.2 in draft Resource Report 2, to ensure responsiveness to the concerns of affected landowners, MVP will evaluate landowner complaints or damage associated with construction. In the unlikely event that any private landowner wells are damaged by Project construction, MVP will negotiate a settlement with the landowner that may include direct repair or replacement. MVP will provide adequate temporary accommodations or a temporary water supply to affected homeowners while their well is repaired or replaced in the event that no other potable water source is readily available. If an impact occurs to a livestock well or an irrigation well, MVP will provide a temporary water source to sustain livestock while a new, permanent water supply well is constructed. MVP will not provide a temporary water source for crops, but would compensate landowners for any losses in crops resulting from well damage.</p> <p>Public groundwater supplies are identified in Section 2.1.3.1 in draft Resource Report 2. MVP will conduct testing of wells or springs used as a water supply. MVP will repair or replace any water supplies, with current and appropriate water rights, that are damaged by construction. No impacts to public water supplies are anticipated due to the short-term duration of proposed construction activities and implementation of best management practices. MVP will utilize a project-specific erosion prevention and sediment control plan in addition to FERC's Plan and Procedures to prevent, minimize, and/or mitigate potential impacts to water supplies. However, if any such impacts were to occur, MVP will coordinate additional evaluation and identification of mitigation measures with the public water supply entity.</p> <p>MVP is in the process of determining the specifics of all PSDs near the alignment. This information will detail intake areas, watersheds, surface water protection zones and other information pertinent relevant to protection of surface and groundwater resources. Specific information concerning PSDs such as Red Sulphur and Big Bend PSDs, and Roanoke County, Peters Mountain Springs, New River, Cherrystone Creek will be reviewed to determine the most protective practices for working within these and other water resource areas.</p>

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
40	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Red Sulphur Public Service District Town of Union Preserve Craig Preserve Monroe New River Conservancy Greenbrier River Watershed Association Multiple Individuals	Impacts to private and public water supplies, specifically in areas of karst geology, especially during construction due to increase in turbidity from exposed trenches and/or accidents Potential for aquifers to be destroyed during construction Monitoring requirements and protocols for water resources, including private wells, during pre-construction, construction, and operation	Resource Report 2, Sections 2.1.1.4, 2.1.4, 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.3, 2.1.3.4, 2.2.2.4, and 2.2.4  Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.2 and 6.6.1.5	<p>MVP will attempt to avoid water sources identified during the routing of the pipeline. Private groundwater wells and municipal water supplies will be identified and verified by affected landowners/stakeholders prior to construction. Construction may temporarily alter springs, bogs or natural seeps. MVP will survey the areas of concern prior to construction and will use best management practices and construction techniques to minimize damage to a particular water source. Best management practices may include the following options: sealing the trench in these specific areas to prevent drainage of the water source away from the trench line, installation of perforated flexible tubing for maintaining drainage, and where necessary a hydrogeologist or geofluvialmorphologist may evaluate the water source and provide a site-specific design to prevent or minimize impacts. Additionally, with landowner permission, MVP will conduct and document water well quality of wells within 150 feet of the edge of the construction work area. MVP will also conduct testing of any State permitted wells or springs used as a water supply. MVP will repair or replace any water supplies, with current and appropriate water rights, that are damaged by construction.</p> <p>Public groundwater supplies are identified in Section 2.1.3.1 in draft Resource Report 2. Private groundwater supplies are discussed in Sections 2.1.3.2 and 2.1.3.3 in draft Resource Report 2. Source protection areas are discussed in Section 2.1.3.4 in draft Resource Report 2.</p> <p>Groundwater concerns in karst terrain are discussed in Section 2.1.1.4 and karst areas crossed by the construction work area are more specifically discussed in Section 6.4.2 in draft Resource Report 6. As discussed in Section 2.1.4 in draft Resource Report 2, potential impacts would be greatest in areas of shallow aquifers, including shallow karst areas. In these areas, potential impacts will be avoided by implementing the same measures from the FERC Procedures and BMPs. MVP is also evaluating specific karst features in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and will develop site-specific measures as appropriate to further ensure that impacts to shallow groundwater will be avoided. Extensive field review of karst features and rock strata are on-going to gain a better understanding of groundwater flow conditions. In addition, property owners will be interviewed to obtain information regarding high/low water flow patterns; and geophysical techniques may be considered in some areas.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 6.6.1.5 in draft Resource Report 6, MVP is completing extensive and careful field review and additional geotechnical evaluation (including geophysical studies in some cases), as necessary, in karst areas crossed by the Project. Route variations will be considered to avoid sinkholes and caves, and to minimize impacts to the karst hydraulic system. Most specifically, MVP will consider route variations to avoid crossing cave passages and entrances. In addition, procedures for karst areas will include specific measures to isolate unanticipated openings that may be encountered during construction to prevent long term impact to ground water and aquifers.</p>

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Karst</i>				
41	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest WVDNR West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Town of Union Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Wild Virginia Appalachian Voices Smith Mountain Lake Association New River Valley Regional Commission Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Presence of extensive karst topography could result in additional impacts, especially with regards to water resources and safety of pipeline  Identification of karst terrain and mines  Specific concerns regarding “The Turnhole”  Specific concerns regarding the and the Coal Bank Ridge Property  See Virginia Speleological Survey 2002-2013 report for Roanoke County  Recommendation to consult with U.S. Geological Survey	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.3, 6.4.2 and 6.6.1.5	Karst areas proposed to be crossed by the construction work area are specifically discussed in Section 6.4.2 in draft Resource Report 6. In these areas, potential impacts will be avoided by implementing the measures from the FERC Procedures and BMPs. MVP is also evaluating specific karst features in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and will develop site-specific measures as appropriate to further ensure that impacts to karst features will be avoided. Field review of karst features and rock strata are on-going to gain a better understanding of potential cave, void, or sink occurrence.  As discussed in Section 6.6.1.5 in draft Resource Report 6, MVP is completing extensive and careful field review and additional geotechnical evaluation (including geophysical studies in some cases), as necessary, in karst areas crossed by the Project. The results of these investigations will be shared with the VDCR as they become available. Specific concerns with identified karst areas will be addressed in the final design after civil and environmental surveys are complete. Route variations are being considered to avoid sinkholes and caves, and to minimize impacts to the karst hydraulic system. Most specifically, MVP will consider route variations to avoid crossing cave passages and entrances. In addition, a karst mitigation plan will be developed to outline construction procedures for karst areas and will include site-specific measures to isolate any unanticipated openings that may be encountered during construction to prevent long term impact to ground water and aquifers. The construction procedures where cave entrances are identified will include coordination with the VDCR.  Karst features in the vicinity of the pipeline alignment, including sinkholes and caves, are discussed in Section 6.4.2 in draft Resource Report 6. The Turnhole sinkhole is not located within 1,000 feet of the pipeline alignment and impacts are not expected.  Mineral resources, including abandoned mines, have been identified in Section 6.3 and Table 6.3-1. As discussed in Section 6.3.3, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the proposed Project. In areas of historic strip mining, MVP will ensure handling of soils and excavated materials to protect water resources (see Resource Report 2) and adjacent soils. The Coal Bank Ridge property will be evaluated for karst and mineral resources.  MVP will consult with the U.S. Geological Survey, and other federal, state, and local agencies, as appropriate on the Project.
42	VDCR DNH VDCR - Virginia Cave Board	Karst geology, specifically the following karst areas that have been documented by VDCR: 1. Clover Hollow Conservation Site 2. Pig Hole Conservation Site 3. Slussers Chapel Conservation Site 4. Old Mill Conservation Site 5. Kimballton Quarry Conservation Site 6. Klotz Quarry Conservation Site 7. Doe Creek Conservation Site 8. Spruce Run Mountain Conservation Site 9. New Thorn Conservation Site 10. Dixie Caverns Conservation Site  In cases of discovery of a cave entrance during construction, DCR should be notified immediately and given opportunity to examine and inventory these features.	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.2 and 6.6.1.5	MVP is currently conducting field surveys to identify pipeline crossing locations within the areas identified by the VDCR. MVP will attempt to avoid impacts to the 10 conservation sites identified by the VDCR. However, should a crossing be necessary, MVP will use best management practices and construction techniques to minimize impacts to the conservation site. Currently, the Pipeline route avoids Kimballton Quarry, Klotz Quarry, Doe Creek, Spruce Run, and New Thorn Conservations Sites.
43	VDCR - Virginia Cave Board	The Virginia Cave Board requests that reports of surveys to identify and map potential sinkholes and karst related features along the proposed route are provided on a quarterly basis.  The Virginia Cave Board provides several general recommendations.	<i>Will be provided in Final RR 6</i>	MVP will provide copies of survey reports as they are completed to the Virginia Cave Board. MVP is evaluating each of the specific recommendations made by the Virginia Cave Board and will include a response to each recommendation in final Resource Report 6 included with MVP’s application to FERC.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
44	Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association	Geological concerns including karst and location of closed coal mine under a portion of the neighborhood	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.3, 6.4.2, 6.6.1.2, and 6.6.1.5	Mineral resources crossed by the pipeline alignment are identified in Section 6.3, Table 6.3-1 in draft Resource Report 6. Karst geology and features crossed by the pipeline alignment - including sinkholes and caves – are identified in Section 6.4.2 in draft Resource Report 6. As discussed in Section 6.6.1.2 in draft Resource Report 6, measures are in place in West Virginia and Virginia that are designed to protect the integrity and service of pipelines in areas where mining is currently taking place or has taken place. As discussed in Section 6.6.1.5 in draft Resource Report 6, MVP will complete extensive and careful field review and additional geotechnical evaluation (including geophysical studies in some cases), as necessary, in karst areas crossed by the Project. Route variations will be considered to avoid sinkholes and caves, and to minimize impacts to the karst hydraulic system. Most specifically, MVP will consider route variations to avoid crossing cave passages and entrances.
<i>Construction, including blasting and steep slopes</i>				
45	Multiple Individuals	Depth to bedrock and soil thickness Inaccuracies in draft Resource Report 6 tables – when these are corrected, additional blasting will likely be required	Resource Report 6, Section 6.2	As stated in Section 6.2 in draft Resource Report 6, the depth to bedrock data was obtained from state-level soil geographic databases (USDA 2015) and more specifically (as referenced): USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database. <a href="http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/ssurgo">http://www.ncgc.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/ssurgo</a> . The SSURGO database information is of a general nature, and is used to screen potential areas of very shallow bedrock and areas that might require blasting. Mechanical rock removal construction methods will be attempted prior to assuming blasting is required at all rock trench encounters. More specific surveys will be conducted prior to construction in order to create site-specific Blasting Plans. Although it is possible that some additional areas might be identified for blasting, it is also possible that some potential areas of shallow bedrock identified at this stage might later be dismissed in relation to the need for blasting.
46	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Preserve Craig	Request for site-specific soil surveys Surveys should adhere to USDA’s minimum protocols	Resource Report 7, Section 7.3	MVP does not plan to conduct site-specific soil surveys since such surveys are not required for the FERC process or other permits. MVP has characterized and evaluated detailed soils information by pipeline milepost in draft Resource Report 7 section 7.3 based on existing USDA soils data. Any additional soil surveys conducted as part of the pipeline design process will adhere to USDA, USGS and ASTM standards.
47	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Craig Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV New River Valley Regional Commission Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Multiple Individuals	Construction of pipelines is associated with increased landslides, especially in areas with steep slopes and/or slip-prone soils Recommend that attention is given to identification and avoidance of these areas, and mitigation measures are incorporated Potential for construction in areas of steep slope to trigger seismic activity Specific concerns with regards to Alternate Route 110J near Sinking Creek Mountain along Hall Road	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.3, 6.6.2.1, and 6.4.1	Alternate routes are still under evaluation and are not addressed in Resource Report 6 at this time. Areas of steep slopes and potential landslide concerns along the pipeline alignment are addressed in Section 6.4.3 in draft Resource Report 6. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation for such hazards are discussed in Section 6.6.2.1 in draft Resource Report 6 with industry accepted soil and slope stabilization methods employed. Seismic hazards are addressed in Section 6.4.1 in draft Resource Report 6. Although construction in areas of steep slopes has the potential to contribute to landslide hazards, there is no indication based on available literature that such construction would trigger seismic activity.
48	Smith Mountain Lake Association	Presence of clay based soil, particularly in Franklin County, which is susceptible to being compacted by heavy construction equipment which could result in increased surface water runoff	Resource Report 7, Sections 7.1.2.3 and 7.3.1.3	In order to minimize compaction, MVP will limit construction traffic within the pipeline construction right-of-way to only that required to accomplish the construction. Following completion of construction, areas of heavy compaction will be identified by Environmental Inspectors (EIs), and these areas will be tilled, as necessary, when soil moisture conditions are suitable. Since impacts related to mechanical compaction are expected to be limited to the upper soil horizon or the contact between the upper horizons, tilling is expected to effectively mitigate the impact. If tilling is not effective, MVP will identify alternative methods (such as deep tilling) to restore the area.
49	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection	Proposed pipeline route may encounter plugged and abandoned gas wells, underground coal mines, and abandoned mine lands	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.3 and 6.3.3	Mineral resources, including abandoned mines, have been identified in Section 6.3 and Table 6.3-1 of draft Resource Report 6. As discussed in Section 6.3.3, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the Project. Mine operators will be contacted to coordinate the design of necessary mitigation measures to be used during construction and operation of the Project. In areas of historic strip mining, MVP will ensure handling of soils and excavated materials to protect water resources (see Resource Report 2) and adjacent soils.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
50	Multiple Individuals	Construction on ridgelines which provide habitat to endangered species	Resource Report 3, Section 3.4	Surveys for listed species are being conducted based on consultation and regulations set forth by federal and state agencies, such as the USFWS, USFS, WVDNR, VDGIF. The results of these surveys will be discussed in Resource Report 3 (for the proposed alignment) and Resource Report 10 (for the alternatives) as well as survey reports.  Recommendations pertaining to the presence or potential absence of listed species and their habitats will be made based on the results of these surveys and agency consultation.
51	Multiple Individuals	Blasting and associated problems including sediment erosion, impaired water quality Specific concerns - In MVP's recent Draft Resource Report 6 (Appendix 6-B) Depth to Bedrock by Milepost and Draft Blasting Plan dated May 2015, the depth to bedrock from milepost 213.4 to 216.3 is 33" for the majority of this area. It is unclear how this has been determined by MVP because the bedrock is visible from the surface of the ground in many areas. In fact, it is almost impossible to dig a hole large enough to plant trees and shrubs due to the amount of surface rock.	Resource Report 2, Sections 2.1.4.2 and 2.2.4  Resource Report 6, Sections 6.2, 6.6.1.1, and Appendix 6-B	Potential areas that might require blasting are discussed in Section 6.2. Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 6.6.1.1 and the Draft Blasting Plan in Appendix 6-B in draft Resource Report 6. MVP will develop and implement its own Project-specific E&SCP that will outline BMPs to avoid and minimize impacts from erosion – including such impacts in relation to blasting activities. Sections 2.1.4.2 and 2.2.4 in draft Resource Report 2 address measures to protect water resources during blasting activities. Those resource reports will be updated in MVP's application to FERC.  As stated in Section 6.2, the depth to bedrock data was obtained from state-level soil geographic databases (USDA 2015) and more specifically (as referenced): USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database. <a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/ssurgo">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/products/datasets/ssurgo</a> . The SSURGO database information is of a general nature, but does successfully identify the subject area as an area of very shallow bedrock that might require blasting or mechanical removal during construction. More specific surveys will be conducted prior to construction in order to create site-specific Blasting Plans. Bedrock outcrops will be identified during these surveys.
52	Multiple Individuals	Explain the configuration and need for a 75-foot right-of-way and possibility of reducing the size of impact in certain zones	<i>Will be included in Final RRI</i>	At this time the pipeline is in the initial design phase and much of the land requirements have not yet been identified. MVP is analyzing specific locations where neck downs and reduced right-of-way may be used to reduce impacts in sensitive resources (i.e., forested areas, streams and wetlands). This information will be provided with Resource Report 1 of MVP's application to the FERC. Typical cross-section drawings showing the proposed right-of-way configuration are included in Appendix 1-D of draft Resource Report 1.
53	Rex Coal Land Co., Inc.	The proposed MVP route will overlay the Pocahontas #7 and the Pocahontas #6 coal seams in the Charmco No. 1 Deep Mine. Substantial resources have been devoted to developing this mine, and the mining permit application has been submitted to and is pending review by the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection. Rex requests that MVP be required to develop a plan that will take into account the impact subsidence from deep and nearby surface mining may have on the proposed pipeline	Resource Report 6, Section 6.3.3	As indicated in Section 6.3.3 of draft Resource Report 6, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the Project. Current information on mines located in the area of proposed pipeline alignment was obtained from a state government mine permit database. Rex Coal Land Company will be contacted to coordinate the design of any necessary mitigation measures to be used during construction and operation of the Project. Mitigation measures will include consideration of potential subsidence from mining operations that might affect the proposed pipeline.
54	Warrior Energy Resources, LLC	EQT was informed of the existence of the coal leases and the fact that Warrior Energy Resources, LLC (Warrior) was in the process of preparing an underground mine permit, which would be impacted by this proposed pipeline route. In fact, EQT was provided with a map of Warrior's mine plans shortly after this meeting concluded. If the route is not adjusted, there will be an adverse impact on the ability to fully extract coal.	Resource Report 6, Section 6.3.3	As indicated in Section 6.3.3 of draft Resource Report 6, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the Project. Current information on mines located in the area of proposed pipeline alignment was obtained from a state government mine permit database. Warrior Energy will be contacted to coordinate the design of any necessary mitigation measures to be used during construction and operation of the Project. Mitigation measures will include consideration of potential adverse impacts on a mining company's ability to extract resources and related financial and operational impacts.
55	Plum Creek Timberlands L.P.	The Project, as currently proposed, will have an impact on existing coal mine operations on Plum Creek Timberlands L.P. (Plum Creek) property in Greenbrier and Nicholas counties of West Virginia. The current proposed location creates negative financial and operational impacts.	Resource Report 6, Section 6.3.3	As indicated in Section 6.3.3 of draft Resource Report 6, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the Project. Current information on mines located in the area of proposed pipeline alignment was obtained from a state government mine permit database. Plum Creek will be contacted to coordinate the design of any necessary mitigation measures to be used during construction and operation of the Project. Mitigation measures will include consideration of potential adverse impacts on a mining company's ability to extract resources and related financial and operational impacts.
56	Alpha Natural Resources Services, LLC	The Project will impact active and future mining operations of at least two of Alpha's affiliates and may impact other Alpha operations. Green Valley's Quinwood No. 7 Mine has an active permit; however mining is not currently ongoing. Grass Creek No. 2 Deep Mine's permit is currently inactive but Green Valley could begin operations should market conditions require it. Brooks Run's Whiteoak-Coltrane Deep Mine is not listed.	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.3 and 6.3.3	As indicated in Section 6.3.3 of draft Resource Report 6, the final Project design will include more specific identification of all mines (historic and active) in the vicinity of the Project. Current information on mines located in the area of proposed pipeline alignment was obtained from a state government mine permit database. Alpha will be contacted to coordinate the design of any necessary mitigation measures to be used during construction and operation of the Project.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Threatened and Endangered Species and Other Protected Resources</i>				
57	VDCR DNH	<p>Potential impacts to northern-long eared bat which could roost during the summer along any portion of the pipeline ROW that includes forested habitat and suitable roost trees</p> <p>Indiana bat which could roost along the western portions of the alignment associated with karst terrain</p> <p>VDCR recommends that timber harvest activities be done during the hibernation season to avoid impacts to these species during summer residency.</p>	Resource Report 3, Section 3.4	Surveys for listed bat species are being conducted in accordance with guidelines set forth by federal and state agencies, USFWS, WVDNR, and VDGIF. The results of these surveys will be provided in an appendix to Resource Report 3 as well as summarized therein (for the proposed alignment) and Resource Report 10 (for the alternatives). Winter tree clearing may occur within areas of known listed bat occurrence.
58	VDCR DNH	<p>VDCR DNH Resources of Concern, which VDCR recommends avoiding, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Candy darter</li> <li>- Smooth coneflower</li> <li>- Appalachian Sugar Maple – Chinquapin Oak Dry Calcareous Forest</li> <li>- Limestone/Dolomite barren (Ridge and Valley Hillslope Type)</li> <li>- Oranegin madtom</li> <li>- Roanoke logperch</li> <li>- Spatulate snowfly</li> <li>- Addison's leatherflower</li> <li>- Canby's mountain lover</li> <li>- Ridge and Valley Dolomite Woodland</li> <li>- Chestnut lip fern</li> <li>- Piedmont fameflower</li> <li>- Significant Community Central Appalachian Basic Ash - Hickory Woodland</li> <li>- Significant Community Central Appalachian Acidic Oak - Hickory Forest</li> <li>- Significant Community Central Appalachian Xeric Chestnut Oak - Virginia Pine Woodland</li> <li>- Weak bluegrass</li> <li>- Prairie dropseed</li> <li>- Southern Piedmont Ultramafic Barren</li> <li>- Central Appalachian Shale Barren</li> <li>- Yellow lance</li> <li>- Atlantic pigtoe</li> <li>- James spinymussel</li> <li>- Central Appalachian Montane Oak - Hickory Forest</li> <li>- Central Appalachian Xeric Chestnut Oak - Virginia Pine Woodland Forest</li> <li>- Box huckleberry</li> <li>- Common snowberry</li> <li>- Central Appalachian Xeric Shale Woodland (Chestnut Oak Mixed Herbs Type)</li> <li>- Central Appalachian Shale Barren (Northern Type)</li> <li>- Piratebush</li> </ul>	Resource Report 3, Section 3.4	Not all of the referenced resources are expected to intersect with the proposed alignment or alternatives. If applicable, surveys for the referenced resources are being conducted as appropriate based on the location of their associated conservation sites with respect to the proposed alignment and alternatives. The results of these surveys will be discussed in Resource Report 3 (for the proposed alignment) and Resource Report 10 (for the alternatives) as well as respective survey reports. Coordination with the VDCR DNH (as well as the other appropriate federal and state agencies) will be conducted at the conclusion of the surveys to determine the next steps, including potential avoidance and mitigation measures.
59	VDCR DNH	<p>State designated caves, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tawney's Cave</li> <li>- Smokehole Cave</li> <li>- Pig Hole Cave</li> <li>- Old Mill Cave</li> <li>- Johnsons Cave (not state-designated)</li> <li>- Slussers Chapel Cave</li> <li>- Mill Creek Cave</li> </ul>	<p>Resource Report 3, Section 3.4</p> <p>Resource Report 6</p>	MVP will coordinate with the VDCR while conducting on-going studies to ensure no protected cave or karst resources will be impacted by the Project. If needed, appropriate intra- or extra-cave surveys will be conducted to address the potential for the feature to support listed bat species. Results of any cave surveys will be included in Resource Report 3. Resource Report 6 will address the geological aspects of the referenced state-designated caves.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
60	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest WVDNR Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Craig County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Greenbrier River Watershed Association Greenbrier River Watershed Association Virginia Native Plant Society Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Preserve Roanoke Wild Virginia Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV Still Meadow Farm Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Impacts to wildlife, (including threatened and endangered species) such as, but not limited to the following: - spring peeper - northern long-eared bat - Virginia big-eared bat - northern flying squirrel - spring peeper frog - eastern box turtle - Golden Eagle - Bald Eagle - American woodcock - James spiny mussel - Roanoke logperch - big sandy crayfish - cerulean warbler - Pleurobema collina - Strophitus undulates - Epioblasma torulosa - frecklebelly madtom - orangefin madtom - Ellet Valley millipede - candy darter - northwestern bull rush - running buffalo clover, - Virginia spiraea - shale barren rock cress - cone flower - small whorled pogonia - salamanders	Resource Report 3, Sections 3.3 and 3.4	Some of these species are not known to exist within the Project area. However, potential impacts to wildlife and mitigation strategies are discussed in Section 3.3.4 of draft Resource Report 3. Habitat is expected to recover quickly and construction activities are of a short-term nature. MVP has tried to reduce forested impacts by avoiding large tracts of forest and collocating with existing rights-of-way to the extent practicable in the siting process. Along with implementing restoration measures contained in the FERC Plan and procedures, MVP is partnering with the Wildlife Habitat Council to restore the pipeline right-of-way using native seed mixes. The seed mixes will especially focus on attracting domestic pollinators.  Surveys are being conducted for potentially occurring threatened and endangered species habitat, and species-specific surveys as appropriate. Surveys are conducted concurrent with guidelines and recommendations provided by the federal and state agencies, USFWS, USFS, WVDNR, and VDGIF. Study plans detailing methodology, surveyors, timing, etc. for listed species surveys have been submitted to appropriate state and federal agencies. To date, study plans have been approved for plants, bats, fish, mussels and bog turtles. Complete reports of findings for all surveys will be included as appendices to Resource Report 3 and summary of these will be included therein (for the proposed alignment) and Resource Report 10 (for the alternatives). Concerns for cerulean warbler, along with various other migratory birds, will be addressed in MVP's Migratory Bird Conservation Plan (See Section 3.3.3 of draft Resource Report 3). Recommendations pertaining to the presence or potential absence of listed species will be made based on the results of these surveys and coordination with the federal and state agencies.
<i>Fish and Wildlife</i>				
61	Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates New River Conservancy Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Impacts of forest fragmentation on wildlife species' habitat	Resource Report 3, Section 3.3.3	MVP has evaluated large tracts of forested land in the siting process to avoid fragmentation where practicable. Impacts of forest fragmentation on migratory birds will be covered in the Migratory Bird Conservation Plan that will be included with the consultation with the USFWS and in Resource Report 3 of MVP's final application to FERC. Potential impacts of forest fragmentation on other wildlife are addressed in section 3.3.3 in draft Resource Report 3.
62	Multiple Individuals	Potential for spread of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) in Whitetail deer	<i>Will be added to Final RR3</i>	The Project is not expected to increase the potential for the spread of CWD in Whitetail deer. In West Virginia CWD is only known to occur in Hampshire and Hardy Counties, over 80 miles east of the Project. Page County, Virginia is the closest known county in Virginia with CWD in free-ranging populations. This county is more than 100 miles east of the Project.
63	Preserve Craig	Increase in deer populations with resultant increase in vehicle-deer collisions, deer-related damage to agricultural and home landscapes, and transmission of diseases via deer-hosted ticks	<i>Will be added to Final RR3</i>	The Project is not expected to have a measureable impact on deer populations.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
64	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest WVDNR Craig County Board of Supervisors Greenbrier River Watershed Association Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Preserve Roanoke Wild Virginia Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Re-vegetation of temporary and permanent easements, especially of morel and ginseng Concerns about potential for spread of invasive (non-native) and noxious species Use of herbicides and pesticides to maintain permanent easement and potential impact to people, livestock, horses and pets	Resource Report 3, Section 3.2.10	Revegetation, control of invasive species, and maintenance of permanent easements is addressed in Resource Report 1, Resource Report 3, and the FERC Plan. Understanding the importance of native habitats and the impact of non-native invasive plant species, MVP is committed to using native seed mixes from a reputable seed supplier for restoration efforts. MVP is working closely with the Wildlife Habitat Council in addition to regulatory agencies to utilize native seed mixtures and successfully restore native habitats after construction to the greatest extent practicable. Per FERC's Plan, MVP will utilize truck wash stations and inspection programs to ensure that equipment comes onto construction work areas clean and free of invasive plant material. MVP has also committed to not utilize pesticides or herbicides during construction and right-of-way and facility maintenance (unless requested by a land management agency) allowing long term usage of the right-of-way for pollinators. Restoring the right-of-way using a combination of quick establishing species and a variety of additional native grasses, forbs and wildflowers has the potential to provide a wide array of benefits. Timely reseeded of the disturbed area minimizes the window of opportunity for non-native invasive species to establish. Seeding with native species also minimizes the potential of unintentionally introducing other non-native species into the habitat.
65	Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV Multiple Individuals	Impacts to honeybees, pollinators and apiaries	Resource Report 3, Section 3.3.4	Pollinators, their habitat, and their vital importance to a healthy ecosystem are drivers of the restoration efforts planned for the MVP Project. MVP is partnering with the Wildlife Habitat Council to restore the pipeline right-of-way using native seed mixes. The seed mixes will especially focus on attracting domestic pollinators. MVP has also committed to not utilize pesticides or herbicides during construction and right-of-way and facility maintenance (unless requested by a land management agency) allowing long term usage of the right-of-way for pollinators. Restoring land using a variety of native grasses, forbs and wildflowers has been known to provide a wide array of benefits to pollinators including honeybees and native bee species as well as butterflies, moths, and hummingbirds. The restored high quality habitat provides essential components such as food, water and shelter to aid pollinating species, including milkweed as a host plant for Monarch butterflies.
<i>Cultural Resources</i>				
66	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Virginia Department of Historic Resources	Potential for impact to historic properties Recommend that architectural and archeological surveys be conducted and that effort is coordinated with appropriate local, state, and federal governments, appropriate Indian tribes, and the public	Resource Report 4, Sections 4.3 and 4.4	As noted in Section 4.3 of draft Resource Report 4, MVP has reached out to a number of federal, state, and local agencies regarding cultural resources related to the Project. Following discussions with the VDHR cultural resources staff, MVP has initiated both archaeological and historic architectural field surveys within the mutually agreed-upon Area of Potential Effects (APE) for direct and indirect effects. MVP's cultural resources team continues to reach out to local, state and federal governments about local cultural resources concerns. Section 4.4 of draft Resource Report 4 describes MVP's communications with Native American tribes to ask for concerns they may have about the Project and MVP's offer to meet with tribes who would want to discuss details of the Project. MVP has also reviewed all comments filed with the FERC related to cultural resources concerns and had discussions with stakeholders who participated in the 16 community outreach meetings that MVP sponsored in the Project area. The MVP team continues to take into consideration all of the concerns expressed about cultural resources and potential effects of the Project. Efforts are underway to plan the Project in a way that will avoid or minimize effects to cultural resources that may be listed in, or may be eligible to be included in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
67	Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors County Commission of Summers County Summers County Historic Landmark Commission Greenbrier River Watershed Association Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Greater Newport Rural Historic District Committee Preserve Giles County Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV Smith Mountain Lake Association Still Meadow Farm Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Cultural resources including, but not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Greater Newport Historical District</li> <li>- North Fork Valley Rural Historic District</li> <li>- Colonel James Graham House</li> <li>- Pence Springs Hotel Historic District</li> <li>- Sarver Cabin</li> <li>- Thomas-Sawyer Site</li> <li>- Col. James Graham Family Barns/Buildings</li> <li>- Margaret Miller Hypes Farm buildings</li> <li>- Roanoke River Basin</li> <li>- Buzzard Rock Site</li> <li>- Shannon site (archeological dig)</li> <li>- Cemeteries, including family cemeteries</li> </ul> Potential for destruction of yet to be discovered cultural resources	Resource Report 4, Sections 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.2.1	Studies are currently ongoing to evaluate the potential effects of the Project on cultural resources based on the direct and indirect Area of Potential Effects (APE) as identified through consultation with the West Virginia Division of Culture and History (WVDCH) and Virginia department of Historic Resources (VDHR) resources. In addition, archaeological resources surveys and historic architecture surveys are underway to record newly identified archaeological sites and historic architectural resources, including historic districts, that may be eligible to the NRHP and that may be affected by the Project. It is MVP's priority to avoid effects to cultural resources that meet the criteria to be eligible to the NRHP. MVP is committed to avoiding cemeteries, which are being identified during the on-going field surveys, in the construction work area. Should MVP find that it is not possible to avoid effects to all NRHP-listed and -eligible resources, then, in consultation with the VDHR and WVDCH, interested Native American tribes and other interested parties, MVP will develop appropriate steps to be taken to mitigate adverse effects to significant cultural resources.
68	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Craig County Board of Supervisors Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV Multiple Individuals	Cultural attachment associated with the environment in the Project Area, including the enjoyment of aesthetic beauty of undisturbed nature and generational attachment to land	<i>Will be mentioned in Final RR 4</i>	A concern brought to the attention of MVP is possible impact to the cultural attachment local people have to their land in areas of The Jefferson National Forest. The United States Forest Service defines cultural attachment as the cumulative effect overtime of a collection of traditions, attitudes and practices, and stories that tie a person to the land, to physical place, and to kinship patterns (USFS 1996:11). MVP will continue to work with local stakeholders in this area to site the Project in a way that would minimize effects to stakeholders' cultural attachment. Because cultural attachment is not a term utilized in state or federal regulations or law, MVP is unable to evaluate this comment further.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics</i>				
69	United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service WVDNR Craig County Board of Supervisors Preserve Craig Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Appalachian Trail Conservancy New River Valley Regional Commission Multiple Individuals	Impacts to state or federally designated lands including parks, forests, management areas, etc. Specific concerns include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jefferson National Forest (specifically Brush Mountain East Wilderness Area and the modification of the Forest Plan to allow for construction and operation of the pipeline in the National Forest)</li> <li>- George Washington National Forest</li> <li>- Appalachian Trail</li> <li>- Burnsville Lake Wildlife Management Area</li> <li>- Potts Creek Wildlife Management Area</li> <li>- The Cascades Waterfall</li> <li>- Hidden Falls</li> <li>- Peters Mountain</li> </ul>	Resource Report 8, Section 8.4.3  Resource Report 10	<p>The Project is proposed to cross the Jefferson National Forest for approximately 12,054 feet in Monroe County, West Virginia and Giles and Montgomery Counties, Virginia at two separate crossing locations. MVP submitted its <i>Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities on Federal Lands (SF-299)</i> to the USFS in November 2014 with regards to the proposed crossing of the Jefferson National Forest and the Appalachian Trail. MVP continues to consult with the NPS and USFS with regards to crossing location, potential impacts, and mitigation strategies. MVP is also evaluating several alternative pipeline routes that include alternative crossing alignments through the Jefferson National Forest and alternative crossing locations of the Appalachian Trail. Mitigation strategies may include co-locating with an existing right-of-way, reducing forest clearing, and conducting a visual impact assessment. Potential visual impacts to Jefferson National Forest, including the Appalachian Trail, Cascade Falls, Brush Mountain Wilderness, and Brush Mountain East Wilderness are discussed in Section 8.4.3 of draft Resource Report 8. The proposed pipeline would not cross the Brush Mountain East Wilderness, and at its closest point the boundary of the wilderness would be 1.6 miles from MP 215.6.</p> <p>The proposed pipeline would cross about 0.1 mile of the Burnsville Lake Wildlife Management Area (WMA). The Burnsville Lake WMA Variation outlined in Section 10.6.2 of draft Resource Report 10 describes how the initially identified route was proposed to cross 1.8 miles of the Burnsville Lake WMA, but MVP was able to identify an alternative pipeline route which is currently included as part of the proposed route in order to avoid all but 0.1 mile of this high quality wildlife habitat.</p> <p>As discussed in Sections 10.5.2, 10.6.4, 10.6.5, and 10.6.6, MVP is evaluating routes that avoid the Cascade Waterfalls and Peters Mountain Wilderness Area. MVP will address potential impacts to and alternatives for the Potts Creek Wildlife Management Area and Hidden Falls in the final application submitted to the FERC. The proposed route does not currently cross Cascade Waterfalls, Peters Mountain Wilderness Area, Potts Creek Wildlife Management Area, or Hidden Falls.</p> <p>MVP is demonstrating its commitment to identify a route with the least overall impact to the environment, cultural resources, and the local communities by continuing to evaluate alternatives and mitigation strategies as we gather additional information from field surveys, agency consultations, and public comment. We appreciate the information provided on regional sensitive resources to aid in this effort. Alternatives considered will be discussed further in the final version of Resource Report 10.</p>
70	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest	Identification of potential impacts on existing special use permits and existing features such as power lines and telephone lines	Resource Report 1, Section 1.4.1.1	As discussed in Section 1.4.1.1 of draft Resource Report 1, civil survey crews will stake the outside limits of the construction right-of-way, the centerline location of the pipeline, elevations, highway and railroad crossings, access roads, and any temporary extra workspace, such as lay down areas or at stream crossings. The “One Call” system of each state will be contacted and underground utilities (e.g., cables, conduits, and pipelines) will be located and flagged. Civil surveys commenced in November 2014.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
71	VDCR DNH	VDCR DNH identified Planning and Recreational Resources (PRR) that could potentially be impacted by the Project including: Stony Creek Road & Scenic Route 42, Appalachian Trail, Blue Ridge Parkway, and Route 785	Resource Report 8, Sections 8.3 and 8.4	<p>MVP is currently evaluating several alternative pipeline routes that include alternative crossing locations of the Appalachian Trail. MVP is coordinating with the USFS, NPS, and Appalachian Trail Conservancy on these proposed crossing locations.</p> <p>MVP has worked through numerous siting studies to identify the optimal location with the least visual impact on the Blue Ridge Parkway (see draft Resource Report 10). The proposed pipeline crosses the parkway within the segment known as the Plateau segment which is between roadway MP 135 and 139 of the parkway. The immediate area where the pipeline crosses the Blue Ridge Parkway is flat to rolling pasture that extends directly up to the road on both sides of the crossing, with more dominant high elevation terrain adjacent to the view. MVP continues to coordinate with the NPS regarding the crossing of the Blue Ridge Parkway.</p> <p>The proposed pipeline is proposed to cross the Catawba Road (Virginia Route 785) at MP 220.3 in open pasture land adjacent to an existing high-voltage transmission line. Visual impacts from the new pipeline right-of-way at the proposed crossing of Catawba Road will be low due to the rolling pasture landscapes which it will cross and which will be replanted with grasses quickly after construction. Higher visual impacts would occur where vegetation is cleared for the pipeline right-of-way on high elevation terrain that could be visible in distant views from Catawba Road.</p> <p>Stony Creek Road and Scenic Route 42 is located in Giles County, VA. The proposed pipeline would cross between the Newport Recreation Area and a high-voltage transmission line. Visual contrast resulting from the removal of forest vegetation for the pipeline right-of-way would likely result in moderate contrast levels due to the adjacent existing power line right-of-way that has already been cut and is maintained clear of tall vegetation, lowering the visual expectations of viewers at the crossing.</p> <p>The Appalachian Trail and Blue Ridge Parkway are discussed in further detail in Sections 8.3.1.1, 8.3.2, 8.3.5, and 8.4.3 of draft Resource Report 8, and Route 785 and Stony Creek Road and Scenic Route 42 are discussed in further detail in Section 8.4.3. MVP will continue to consult with federal and state agencies to identify alternatives, and minimize and/or mitigate for impacts on resources proposed to be crossed. MVP will provide updates in its application to FERC.</p>
72	VDCR DNH	<p>VDCR DNH conservation sites, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stony Creek Stream Conservation Unit</li> <li>- Upper Mill Creek Conservation Site</li> <li>- Mill Creek Springs Natural Area Preserve</li> <li>- Blake Preserve</li> <li>- Roanoke River – North and South Forks Conservation Unit</li> <li>- Elliston Glades Conservation Site</li> <li>- Pedlar Hills Natural Area Preserve</li> <li>- Grass Hill Conservation Site</li> <li>- Jacks Creek Conservation Site</li> <li>- Pigg River – Owens Creek Stream Conservation Unit</li> <li>- Mudlick Branch Woodland Conservation Site</li> <li>- Craig Creek - Johns Creek Stream Conservation Unit</li> <li>- Sinking Creek Mountain Conservation Site</li> <li>- Lynn Hollow Conservation Site</li> <li>- Fort Lewis Mountain Slope</li> <li>- Trout Creek Barren Conservation Site</li> <li>- Pickles Branch Conservation Site</li> <li>- Sugar Bottom Hollow Conservation Site</li> </ul>	Resource Report 3, Section 3.4	<p>Not all of the listed conservation sites are expected to be within the study corridor for the proposed alignment or alternatives. Applicable resources associated with the referenced conservation sites will be addressed in Resource Report 3 (for the proposed alignment) and Resource Report 10 (for the alternatives) as well as respective survey reports that will be submitted to the appropriate federal and state agencies upon completion. Coordination with the VDCR DNH (as well as the other appropriate federal and state agencies) will be conducted at the conclusion of the surveys to determine the next steps, including potential avoidance and mitigation measures.</p>

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
73	Blue Ridge Land Conservancy	<p>Blue Ridge Land Conservancy parcels, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coal Bank Ridge property in Montgomery County</li> <li>- Higginbotham property in Franklin County</li> <li>- Garst and Prettyman properties on Cahas Mountain in Franklin County</li> </ul> <p>These easements protect important environmental resources that have been identified by local governments, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the federal government as worthy of protection from the kind of commercial/industrial development and ecological disturbance associated with the construction of the proposed MVP. Lands protected with conservation easements are incompatible with a 42" natural gas transport pipeline.</p>	<i>Will be included in Final RR8 and RR 10</i>	<p>MVP continues to consult with the Blue Ridge Land Conservancy in regard to conservation easement parcels located in Montgomery and Franklin Counties. MVP has been evaluating alternatives near these properties as outlined in draft Resource Report 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coal Bank Ridge property is not currently proposed to be crossed but is being considered as part of an alternative to minimize construction disturbance to residences as discussed in Section 10.6.9 of draft resource Report 10.</li> <li>• The Higginbotham property is discussed in Section 10.6.14</li> <li>• MVP has proposed Alternative 210 to minimize impacts to Cahas Mountain as discussed in Section 10.6.15 of draft resource Report 10</li> </ul> <p>Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures will be addressed in the final version of Resource Report 8. Alternatives considered will be discussed further in the final version of Resource Report 10.</p>
74	<p>Craig County Board of Supervisors Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association New River Conservancy Virginia Outdoors Foundation Multiple Individuals</p>	<p>Conservation easements, the intent for which would be destroyed by a pipeline easement, managed by state and non-state entities, including, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Land Conservancy</li> <li>- Virginia Outdoors Foundation</li> <li>- New River Land Trust</li> <li>- Blue Ridge Land Conservancy</li> <li>- Valley Conservation Council</li> <li>- New River Conservancy</li> </ul> <p>Wildlife habitat restoration projects Parcels under contract for restoration of rare and declining habitat with U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. Specific parcels including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Slusser's Chapel Conservancy</li> <li>- Old Mill Conservancy</li> </ul>	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	<p>MVP continues to consult with local and state agencies to identify parcels that are managed by conservation agencies such as Blue Ridge Land Conservancy, National Land Conservancy, Virginia Outdoors Foundation, New River Land Trust, Valley Conservation Council, and The Nature Conservancy. Federal, state, recreation, and conservation lands crossed by or located within 0.25 mile of the Project that have already been identified are described in Table 8.3-1 in draft Resource Report 8. Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures, including to Slusser's Chapel Conservancy and Old Mill Conservancy, will be addressed in the final version of Resource Report 8.</p> <p>Visual impacts to conserved lands were assessed from a series of Key Observation Points (KOPs) that are discussed in Section 8.4.3 of draft Resource Report 8. Parcels under contract for restoration of rare and declining habitat with U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service were not considered as KOPs unless the parcel had visual sensitivity to change or a public component (i.e. trails, scenic overlook, etc.).</p>
75	<p>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Craig County Board of Supervisors Preserve Craig Greenbrier River Watershed Association Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter The Border Conservancy Adventure Cycling Association Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV New River Conservancy Multiple Individuals</p>	<p>Impacts to scenic and recreational qualities of Appalachian Trail (Dragon's Tooth and McAfee's Knob; Cascades Waterfall), Jefferson National Forest, George Washington National Forest, Blue Ridge Parkway, TransAmerica Bicycle Trail, U.S. Bicycle Route 76, and Catawba Road (Route 785) – Virginia Scenic Byway) Visual impact of forest fragmentation, especially in protected lands such as national forests Request for a visual impact assessment to determine aesthetic impacts from the permanent right-of-way</p>	Resource Report 8, Section 8.4.3	<p>Visual impacts to conserved lands were assessed from a series of KOPs that are discussed in Section 8.4.3 of draft Resource Report 8. At these locations, MVP will coordinate with the land owner, manager, and/or associated organization to identify areas of concern and ways to minimize impacts on the property and use by its members during construction. Impacts may include limitations on access and visual/noise disturbance from construction equipment. MVP will conduct further visual analysis at highly sensitive visual areas such as the Appalachian Trail and Blue Ridge Parkway crossings. These analyses will be conducted in coordination with the appropriate land managing agency and will be provided in MVP's application with FERC.</p> <p>Visual impacts were not assessed for Alternative Route 110R though viewpoints were chosen for future analysis, including the base of Dragon's Tooth. If the alternative route is chosen as the preferred route, a visual impact analysis will be performed for the route from these points. It should also be noted that many of the locations in the comment are already covered in the visual analysis. McAfee's Knob was not included in the visual analysis because it is over 8 miles from the alternative route and over 13 miles from the proposed pipeline.</p> <p>Project-related changes to the existing landscape and scenic views are not expected to significantly affect the overall recreation and tourism experiences of residents and visitors to the region or discourage people from relocating to or visiting the region. Impacts to important recreation resources on public lands would be minimized through consultation with the appropriate land management agencies.</p>

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
76	Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Preserve Roanoke Smith Mountain Lake Association Multiple Individuals	Impacts to Camp Roanoke, Spring Hollow Reservoir, Poor Mountain, Smith Mountain Lake, Roanoke River Blueway, Bottom Creek, Bent Mountain, and other recreation areas, landmarks, and attractions	<i>Will be included in Final RR8 and RR10</i>	MVP continues to consult with federal, state, and local agencies to identify recreational resources that could potentially be impacted by the Project. Identified recreational resources will be addressed in the final version of Resource Report 8 included with MVP's application to the FERC, including potential impacts and proposed mitigation to reduce and/or eliminate these impacts. MVP has been evaluating alternatives near several of these properties as outlined in draft Resource Report 10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative 135 addressed in Section 10.6.11 of draft Resource Report 10 moves the route further from Camp Roanoke and the Spring Hollow Reservoir</li> <li>An alternative regarding the crossing of Poor Mountain is discussed in Section 10.6.12 of draft Resource Report 10. Although both the variation and the currently proposed route would cross Poor Mountain, please note the siting of this area will continue to be thoroughly evaluated as additional information is gathered through field surveys and agency consultations.</li> </ul> <p>Additional alternatives considered will be discussed further in the final version of Resource Report 10.</p>
77	U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service	The National Park Service provided information on nearby resources of concern should the proposed route change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Natural Landmark, Greenville Saltpepper Cave</li> <li>National Historic Landmarks: Weston State Hospital and Pittsylvania County Courthouse</li> <li>National Coal Heritage Area in West Virginia</li> </ul>	Resource Report 8, Section 8.3.2	As noted, the proposed pipeline route does not currently impact the National Natural Landmark, Greenville Saltpepper Cave, and National Historic Landmarks, Weston State Hospital and Pittsylvania County Courthouse. MVP will notify the NPS, and as appropriate the Greenville Saltpepper Cave land manager, should a route alternative be proposed closer to these locations. Also, as recommended by the NPS, MVP will contact the National Coal Heritage Area manager for their input.
78	United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Preserve Craig Multiple Individuals	Creation of pathways for off-road vehicles and ATVs, especially in national forests	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	MVP will work in cooperation with the Forest Service to assist in developing public enhancements in areas where additional public use access or deterrence of public use access would be beneficial.
79	Preserve Franklin Multiple Individuals	Trespassing by land agents/surveyors Complaints about use of legal means to gain survey permission	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	MVP is confident that we have the legal authority under both Virginia and West Virginia statutes to access property for survey activity, as long as we comply with the strict requirements of the respective state's law. We respect the sanctity of every landowner's property; and we are dedicated to treating every landowner with the dignity, and respect they deserve. Therefore, and to the greatest extent we possibly can, we prefer not to survey landowners' properties without their permission. In the small number of cases where we do not receive a landowner's permission, we have the authority under state law to survey their property as long as we provide 15-day notice to Virginia landowners, and a 10-day notice to West Virginia landowners, by certified mail. <p>These letters provided notification of our intent to utilize legal action to allow our surveyors to access their properties for the purpose of performing environmental survey activity, should the landowner continue to deny property access. These surveys are critical and are designed to evaluate the proposed pipeline routes currently under consideration and ultimately determine the route that has the least overall impact on the environment, landowners, and cultural and historic resources. The long-standing survey access laws of each state were established for utilities to accomplish survey activities necessary for accurate information needed for the permitting process.</p>

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
80	Multiple Individuals	Acreage of impact for temporary and permanent easements, access roads, construction dispersal, and pumping facilities Land use type for all impacted lands including details on annual property tax by land use type/acreage of impact	Resource Report 8, Section 8.1	<p>Pipeline right-of-way workspace configurations and dimensions will be indicated on the alignment sheets, as well as on the typical right-of-way configuration drawings, both of which will be included with the final version of Resource Report 1 included with MVP's application to FERC. A summary of the Project's overall land impacts is provided in Table 1.3-1 in draft Resource Report 1. Table 8.1-1 in draft Resource Report 8 identifies land uses crossed by the pipeline (including percent of total Project) and Table 8.1-2 in draft Resource Report 8 identifies acreage affected by land use type during construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>Historically, natural gas pipeline easements have had no measureable effect on property values. A 2001 national case study performed by the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) revealed no significant impact on the sales price of property located along natural gas pipelines. They further determined that neither the size of the pipeline (diameter) nor the product carried by a pipeline had any significant impact on sales price. The study also concluded that the presence of a pipeline did not impede the development of surrounding properties. More recent studies investigating property values near natural gas pipelines are consistent with the findings of this earlier work. In 2008 (Fruits), a study evaluated the impact of the South Mist Pipeline Extension on residential home sales in two Oregon counties. Based on sales price data for more than 10,000 homes located within one mile of the pipeline, the study found that proximity to the pipeline had no statistically or economically significant impact on residential property values. Another 2008 study (PGP Valuation) relating to the same pipeline concluded that high-pressure natural gas pipelines had no measurable long-term impact on property values. The study also concluded that variations in short-term values were either not substantial or non-existent and that residential properties were not impacted by the pipeline easement any more or less than other property types.</p>
81	Multiple Individuals	Impact on homes from construction activity, concerns about how close construction can occur to a home	Resource Report 8, <i>additional information to be added to Final RR8</i>	Impact on residences from pipeline construction is discussed in Section 8.2.2 of draft Resource Report 8. Where pipeline construction would be in the vicinity of residences MVP will implement a number of measures designed to minimize temporary construction impacts on the residences. Also, consistent with FERC requirements, MVP will prepare site-specific residential mitigation plans for all residences that would be within 50 feet of the construction work area.
82	Multiple Individuals	MVP's misrepresentation of information including unidentified homes along the route due to the use of outdated maps from the 1990s Example: Berry Patch Lane – several homes within 0.5 mile of the proposed route have not been identified despite Paul Friedman's request for MVP to identify all residential areas, housing tracts or subdivisions within 0.5 mile of the route Concerns about MVP's definition of a "populated area" with regards to routing through residential areas	<i>Will be included in Final RR1</i>	<p>MVP is still in the process of obtaining information on all populated areas along the pipeline route. There are several areas where access is limited due to landowner denials of access and therefore accurate analysis of homes cannot be made at this time. This information will be verified with ground surveys, which has been hampered by landowner access permission in the specific areas noted in the comment filing. The preliminary analysis documented in the draft report was performed using the most recent aerial photography data available for the project area in access restricted areas. MVP has updated the public data available with aerial photography of the route (dated December 2014 and April 2015) that will be included in its application with the FERC.</p> <p>MVP has clarified in draft Resource Report 10 that use of the term "populated area" refers to population centers such as cities or towns, not individual residential spatial relationship.</p>
83	Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Multiple Individuals	Use of eminent domain	Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.4	<p>As discussed in Section 5.3.4 of draft Resource Report 5, only after all avenues of negotiation have been exhausted would MVP consider using the eminent domain process. As eminent domain authority can only be utilized once a pipeline project has been approved by the FERC, it does not apply to the non-invasive, preliminary surveying activities that occur when studying proposed or alternative pipeline routes. Upon survey completion and final route determination, the MVP project team will contact landowners to discuss the crossing of the pipeline route on their properties. Construction details and easement issues will be discussed in-depth, as it is our goal to ensure landowners receive as much information as they desire so that both parties are mutually comfortable moving forward.</p> <p>Once an agreement has been reached, MVP will compensate each landowner for the right-of-way access and any surface disturbances. These agreements are negotiated on an individual basis as each landowner's property size and situation are unique.</p> <p>If the FERC authorizes the project and the necessary easement cannot be negotiated with a property owner, the pipeline operator is granted the right of eminent domain under Section 7(h) of the Natural Gas Act. In this case, it would be the court that would determine the fair compensation given to a landowner in return for an easement.</p>
84	Multiple Individuals	Inconsistencies between the Project and existing land use plans, building regulations, and zoning regulations Example: Montgomery County Comprehensive Plan	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	Zoning regulations and local land use ordinances and policies will be addressed in the final version of Resource Report 8 included with MVP's application to FERC.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
85	Adventure Cycling Association Multiple Individuals	Increased heavy equipment traffic and associated diesel fuel and hydraulic fluid pollution, with specific concerns about traffic on I-81 and across Norfolk-Southern railroads	<i>Will be included in Final RRI</i>	MVP will develop a Project-specific SPCC Plan to address potential spills associated with the Project. MVP will prepare a Traffic Management Plan that will identify current traffic patterns along the pipeline route, impacts analysis of increased construction traffic from Project construction, and mitigation measures to reduce impacts on existing traffic patterns. This Traffic Management Plan will be developed prior to the start of construction activities.
86	Craig County Board of Supervisors Preserve Greenbrier County Multiple Individuals	Damage to roads and railroads		MVP will obtain all necessary road crossing and use permits including required road bonds necessary for construction vehicle usage. MVP will work with the governing agency and facilitate repair of any significant damage caused by construction activities. MVP will also obtain railroad crossing permits and work with the individual rail owners to cross those features unobtrusively.
87	Monroe County Organic District Greenbrier River Watershed Association Multiple Individuals	Restriction of post-construction activities on permanent ROW including organic farming certification and construction of fencing, pools, decks, tool sheds, barns, trees, septic tanks or leach fields, garages, trees, and shrubs	Resource Report 8, Section 8.1.3.1	As discussed in Section 8.1.3.1 in draft Resource Report 8, impacted agricultural land will be restored to pre-construction conditions in accordance with the FERC Plan following construction. Agricultural land affected by the construction right-of-way and ATWS would be allowed to revert to prior use, with the exception of tree crops within the permanent right-of-way. MVP will work with landowners to understand post-construction land use activity and the construction would be designed in order to allow use of the easement for farming activity and to identify specific areas where heavy machinery could cross the easement without damaging the pipeline.  Construction of major facilities, including pools, decks, tool sheds, barns and septic tanks, will not be permitted in the permanent right-of-way to protect the integrity of the pipeline. Tree crops are also prohibited in the permanent right-of-way.  MVP is consulting with state and local agencies to identify organic farms that might be impacted by the current route and will provide the results of this analysis and proposed mitigation measures in its application to FERC.
88	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Adventure Cycling Association Multiple Individuals	Impact to recreational uses including hunting, biking, hiking, fishing (see Orvis Fly Fishing School), and wildlife watching (see Pig Hole Cave)	Resource Report 8, Sections 8.1.3.7, 8.3.1 and 8.3.2	Recreational resources potentially impacted by Project facilities are discussed in Sections 8.1.3.7, 8.3.1, and 8.3.2 in draft Resource Report 8. Pig Hole Cave will be avoided by the Project.
<i>Socioeconomics</i>				
89	Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors County Commission of Summers County Craig County Board of Supervisors Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association Preserve Monroe Greenbrier River Watershed Association Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Preserve Roanoke Wild Virginia Roanoke River Basin Association Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Impacts to residential land use including decreased property value and associated tax losses for municipalities; determination of appropriate compensation for permanent easement; and, potential impact to mortgages and insurances due to decreased property values	Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.4  Resource Report 8, Section 8.2	Impacts to residential land use are addressed in Section 8.2 of draft Resource Report 8. Potential impacts to residential and other property values are addressed in Section 5.3.4 of draft Resource Report 5. Review of available literature (Allen, Williford & Seale, Inc. 2001; Whatcom County 2001; Fruits 2008) on the impacts of pipelines on property values suggests that high pressure natural gas pipelines have little to no effect on property values. Therefore, the presence of a pipeline is not expected to lower assessed property values or result in tax losses to municipalities or other government entities, or affect mortgages or property insurance. Rather, operation of the pipeline is expected to generate additional ad valorem revenues for local governments based on the estimated value of the pipeline. Estimated ad valorem revenues are presented by county in Table 5.3-2 in draft Resource Report 5.  For private and non-federal public lands, MVP will negotiate a mutually agreed-upon easement for the pipeline with the affected landowners. The issue of compensation is addressed in Section 5.3.4 of draft Resource Report 5.
90	Craig County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Greenbrier River Watershed Association Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Save Monroe, Inc. The Border Conservancy of Monroe County, WV Smith Mountain Lake Association Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Compensation for loss of timber resources and agricultural productivity, including maple sap production	Resource Report 8, Sections 8.1.3.1 and 8.1.3.3	Compensation for loss of timber resources is addressed in Section 8.1.3.3 of draft Resource Report 8. MVP will compensate landowners for the value of trees felled during construction; compensation will be based on a timber appraisal provided by a local timber expert. Compensation for impacts to agriculture is discussed in Section 8.1.3.1 of draft Resource Report 8. As explained in this section, compensation will vary by type of impact.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
91	Montgomery County Board of Supervisors	Impacts to farmland protection areas in Agricultural and Forestal District (AFD) #2 in Catawba Valley and AFD #9 in Elliston/Pedlars Hills	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	MVP will review aerial photography and continue consultation with local and state agencies to identify parcels that are under local and/or state farmland protection programs such as the Monroe County, West Virginia Voluntary Farmland Protection Program and the Agricultural/Forrestal Districts Program in Montgomery County, Virginia. Farmland protection areas potentially impacted by the Project will be discussed in the final version of Resource Report 8 included in MVP's application to FERC.
92	Multiple Individuals	Request for payment of royalties on an annual basis for use of permanent right-of-way	<i>Will be included in Final RR8</i>	Consistent with industry practice, MVP plans to compensate affected landowners on a one-time basis for the temporary and permanent rights-of-way. Perpetual compensation for the pipeline easement is not an acceptable industry standard as there is no additional property disturbance once the right-of-way is reclaimed. Should a repair or significant additional disturbance need to be made in the future for maintenance, the landowner can request damage compensation options that may be listed in the easement agreement.
93	Multiple Individuals	Loss of habitat for medicinal plants such as ginseng and golden seal which could provide income	<i>Will be included in Final RR5</i>	The potential for loss of habitat for medicinal plants that have a measureable economic impact will be evaluated in the final Resource Report 5 included with MVP's application to FERC.
94	U.S. Department of Agriculture – George Washington and Jefferson National Forest Multiple Individuals	Loss of mineral interest ownership of underlying pipeline area	Resource Report 6, Sections 6.3, 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, and 6.3.4	Exploitable and potentially-exploitable mineral resources occur in the area affected by the Project, including coal, shale, and oil and gas resources. Mineral resources within 0.25 mile of the Project were identified from a review of topographic maps, USGS and state database searches, and field studies. Table 6.3-1 in draft Resource Report 6 lists the mineral resources identified. MVP will coordinate with landowners and negotiate compensation where applicable.
95	Multiple Individuals	Impact to businesses located within the temporary or permanent easement and/or affected by the altered viewshed	Resource Report 8, Section 8.4.3	Visual impacts were assessed from a series of KOPs which are discussed in Section 8.4.3 of draft Resource Report 8. A viewshed analysis of the entire Project is not required and has not been prepared.
96	Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Craig County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Preserve Craig Greenbrier River Watershed Association Adventure Cycling Association Appalachian Voices Multiple Individuals	Impacts to tourism due to altered viewshed and air, noise, and light pollution from construction and operation, particularly around the compressor stations	Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2.3	Potential impacts to tourism are discussed in Section 5.3.2.3 of draft Resource Report 5. Project-related changes to the existing landscape and scenic views are not expected to significantly affect the overall recreation and tourism experiences of residents and visitors to the region or discourage people from relocating to or visiting the region. Impacts would be greatest during construction and these impacts will be temporary and short lived. Impacts to important recreation resources on public lands would be minimized through consultation with the appropriate land management agencies.
97	Multiple Individuals	Request for additional details on the type, number, and duration of jobs that are associated with the MVP Project	<i>Will be included in Final RR5</i>	Additional detail on the type, number, and duration of jobs associated with construction and operation of the Project will be provided in the final version of Resource Report 5 included with MVP's application to FERC, but have been estimated in draft Resource Report 5, Appendix 5-A.
98	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Craig County Board of Supervisors Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Greenbrier River Watershed Association Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Environmental Justice concerns	Resource Report 5, Sections 5.2.7 and 5.3.8	Environmental Justice concerns are addressed in Sections 5.2.7 and 5.3.8 of draft Resource Report 5. Construction and operation of the Project are not expected to result in adverse and disproportionate human health or environmental effects to these communities.
<i>Air, Noise and Light</i>				
99	Blue Ridge Land Conservancy Chesapeake Climate Action Network	Impacts of elimination of forested land on the ability of local governments to meet federal mandates for clean air Impacts to carbon sequestration	<i>Will be included in Final RR9</i>	Clearing of forested land for the pipeline right-of-way and compressor stations is not expected to have a significant effect on the ability of local governments to meet federal mandates for clean air, which are contained in the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Forested land plays no significant role in the removal of most air pollutants from the atmosphere. Instead, the federal standards for acceptable ambient concentrations of air pollutants are met chiefly by reducing emissions from existing sources of air pollution, and by requiring new sources to meet stringent emission standards, and in certain cases to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS through air dispersion modeling.  The final version of Resource Report 9 will quantify the potential loss of carbon sequestration capacity from clearing of forest land for the Project right-of-way. While young trees do absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere as they grow, mature forests have a net carbon dioxide removal rate that is close to zero, because much of the absorbed carbon is actually returned to the atmosphere by the decay of dead leaves and tree limbs. The existing forested land along the proposed pipeline route therefore already stores most of the carbon it is capable of capturing, and the clearance of this land for the lifetime of the Project may be characterized as a measureable, but finite, one-time carbon release equivalent to the amount of carbon currently stored in the forested areas to be cleared.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
100	Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Greenbrier County Board of Health Greenbrier River Watershed Association Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Greater Roanoke Valley Asthma and Air Quality Coalition Adventure Cycling Association Smith Mountain Lake Association New River Valley Regional Commission Multiple Individuals	Air, noise and light pollution associated with compressor stations, particularly with the ridges and valleys in the region, including any potential construction and operation impacts to all criteria pollutants under the NAAQS, any significant concentration of hazardous air pollutants and the protection of public health Impacts from compressor station blowdowns	Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.4, <i>additional analysis will be included in Final RR 9</i>	The final version of Resource Report 9 will include an in depth assessment of noise and air pollution that meets the FERC requirements. MVP will obtain necessary air permits from the relevant state regulatory authorities for the Project.  As stated in Section 9.1.4 of draft Resource Report 9, the combustion turbines selected for the compressor stations will burn only natural gas, and will comply with the federal air pollutant emission standards established for new combustion turbines. Operating emissions of air pollutants from the compressor stations, including hazardous air pollutants and greenhouse gases, will be quantified in the final version of Resource Report 9. Total emissions from each compressor station are expected to remain below federal thresholds for major stationary sources of air pollution, and ambient concentrations of air pollutants at nearby sensitive locations, such as homes or publicly-accessible lands. The Project will remain in compliance with the federal NAAQS, established for the protection of human health and the environment.  Operating emissions of air pollutants from the compressor stations, including hazardous air pollutants, greenhouse gases, and normal operations associated releases will be quantified in the final version of Resource Report 9.  Light pollution from compressor stations will be addressed as a night time visual impact in final Resource Report 8.
101	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection	Placement of proposed compressor stations, especially with regards to attainment status with NAAQS	<i>Will be included in Final RR9</i>	The proposed locations for the compressor stations are currently in attainment for all NAAQS. The air permit applications submitted to the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection for the compressor stations will include sufficient information to demonstrate continued compliance with all NAAQS, including results of air dispersion modeling, if determined by WVDEP to be necessary.
102	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Natural Resources Defense Council Greenbrier River Watershed Association Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Chesapeake Climate Action Network Roanoke Appalachian Trail Club Wild Virginia Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Climate change and greenhouse gas emissions Potential for methane gas leakage to contribute to climate change	<i>Will be included in Final RR9</i>	The final version of Resource Report 9 will quantify potential greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the Project, including fugitive methane leakage. Natural gas has lower emissions than other fossil fuels; therefore, the usage of natural gas instead of other fossil fuels can reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Project region. The final version of Resource Report 9 will also include a qualitative discussion of cumulative climate change impacts in the Project area, while acknowledging that such impacts cannot be attributed to any single action.
103	Multiple Individuals	Request for a lifecycle analysis of emissions related to natural gas from extraction through transportation and distribution	<i>Will be included in Final RR9</i>	The final version of Resource Report 9 will quantify potential greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of directly-related Project facilities within the scope of the FERC review.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
104	U.S. Environmental Protection Montgomery County Board of Supervisors WVDNR Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Town of Union Greenbrier River Watershed Association Preserve Craig Natural Resources Defense Council Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Greater Newport Rural Historic District Committee Trout Unlimited Wild Virginia New River Conservancy Smith Mountain Lake Association Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Recommend a thorough cumulative impact analysis is conducted including review of multiple pipeline projects, and infrastructure to support the projects, in a concentrated area	Resource Report 1, Section 1.10	A complete cumulative impacts analysis will be provided with final Resource Report 1 in MVP's application to the FERC. Projects in the vicinity of the MVP Project will be identified and potential cumulative impacts will be analyzed as they relate to the Project. Projects will be summarized in a table that will include the name of the project, scope, distance and direction from the Project, and resources that may experience cumulative impacts.
105	Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Appalachian Trail Conservancy Multiple Individuals	Cumulative climate change impacts from multiple projects	<i>Will be included in Final RR9</i>	The final version of Resource Report 9 will quantify potential greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the Project, and will include an estimate of cumulative greenhouse gas emissions from other projects identified and included within the cumulative effects analysis.
<i>Safety and Reliability</i>				
106	Coal Bank Ridge Homeowners Association	Safety ("blast zone"); entrance/egress of the development is crossed in two locations (Coal Bank Hollow Road) 28 developed properties and 22 undeveloped proposed in Coal Bank Ridge are located within the "blast zone"	Resource Report 10, Section 10.6.9  Resource Report 11, Section 11.3	These comments refer to the pipeline route called Alternative 87, which is currently not the proposed pipeline route. A comparison of environmental impacts between Alternative 87 and the current proposed route, including residences within 50 feet of the construction work area, is included in Section 10.6.9 of draft Resource Report 10. If MVP, or FERC, determines that Alternative 87 is the preferred route, the pipeline in the area would be designed, constructed, and maintained to meet U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) safety standards as described in draft Resource Report 11, including measures to protect the public described in Section 11.3 of draft Resource Report 11.
107	Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League Multiple Individuals	EQT/NextEra's safety and environmental compliance records	Resource Report 11, Section 11.2	EQT and NextEra's safety records are discussed in Section 11.2 of draft Resource Report 11.  EQT's safety and environmental performance information can be found in EQT's Corporate Social Responsibility Report at the following link: <a href="https://www.eqt.com/our-responsibility/sustainability">https://www.eqt.com/our-responsibility/sustainability</a> .  NextEra's environmental performance information can be found in NextEra's Corporate Responsibility Report at the following link: <a href="http://www.nexteraenergy.com/crr/">http://www.nexteraenergy.com/crr/</a>
108	Virginia State Senator John S. Edwards Town of Union Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter Smith Mountain Lake Association Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Multiple Individuals	Concern that proposed route crosses St. Clair's fault, which has been rated as moderate to high by USGS for incidence of eruption, and other areas of historic seismic activity	Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.1.3	The St. Clair fault is discussed in Section 6.4.1.3 of draft Resource Report 6. According to a recent USGS study (2014a), this fault and the Pembroke Fault Zone are part of a thrust fault area that is not tectonically active. The St. Clair fault is noted in the discussion as not having any recent (Quaternary) movement. Therefore, the proposed route crossing of the fault is not considered a seismic concern. Seismic hazards, including earthquakes, faults, and soil liquefaction are discussed in Section 6.4.1 of Resource Report 6. MVP's evaluation of potential seismic hazards found that the proposed pipeline alignment is not located in any areas of specific seismic concern in relation to the proposed pipeline.
109	Multiple Individuals	Use of fly ash as backfill in areas where MVP must excavate trenches through rock Use of fly ash as backfill can result in impacts to water resources	Resource Report 1, Section 1.4.1.1  Resource Report 7, Section 7.3	Draft Resource Report 1 specifically states that fly ash will not be used as backfill material mainly due to concerns about the acidity of fly ash and its potential impacts on cathodic protection on the pipeline. MVP will reiterate this in the final version of Resource Report 1. Limestone dust or sand, which is typically basic and will often aid in the cathodic protection of the pipeline, may be used as backfill material. This material will have no impact on water resources. The final version of Resource Report 7 will re-state this protective measure in Section 7.3.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
110	Craig County Board of Supervisors Montgomery County Board of Supervisors County Commission of Summers County Greenbrier River Watershed Association Preserve Craig Southern Environmental Law Center Center for Biological Diversity Appalachian Mountain Advocates Smith Mountain Lake Association Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Additional NGOs Multiple Individuals	Blast radius and potential for a major catastrophe	Resource Report 11, Section 11.1	Hazards associated with natural gas pipelines and industry standards for pipeline design and construction to avoid or minimize hazards are addressed in Section 11.1 of draft Resource Report 11. The potential impact radius is explained in Section 11.1.3. The 42-inch diameter pipeline with a MAOP of 1,480 psig would have a potential impact radius of 1,115 feet.
111	Greenbrier River Watershed Association Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter New River Valley Regional Commission Multiple Individuals	Leak detection and monitoring procedures	Resource Report 11, Section 11.3	MVP will implement a number of measures to protect the public, including leak detection and monitoring, as described in Section 11.3 of draft Resource Report 11.
112	Multiple Individuals	Potential for corrosion of the pipeline	Resource Report 11, Section 11.3.12	Corrosion control for the pipeline is discussed in Section 11.3.12 of Resource Report 11. MVP will cathodically protect the pipeline with impressed current systems. The cathodic protection of MVP will be compliant with DOT 49 CFR 192. Any interference issues created by energizing the new cathodic protection systems will be dealt with by using industry corrosion committees in both West Virginia and Virginia to notify pipeline and other utility operators in the vicinity of MVP that the systems are going to be energized. MVP will assist with interference testing between our new cathodic protection systems and any interested party's facilities to insure that interference issues are resolved to the satisfaction of both parties.
113	Montgomery County Board of Supervisors Roanoke County Board of Supervisors Craig County Board of Supervisors Greenbrier County Board of Health Multiple Individuals	Disaster preparedness training/equipment support for local First Responders Limited capacity of local first responders	Resource Report 11, Sections 11.3.3 and 11.3.8	Emergency response in general is discussed in Section 11.3.3 and liaison procedures with local authorities are covered in Section 11.3.8 of draft Resource Report 11.
114	Greenbrier River Watershed Association Laurel Mountain Preservation Association Multiple Individuals	Impacts to health of nearby individuals, especially children, from leaking carcinogenic substances that will enter water resources and environment Potential for exposure to ultrafine particles known to be carcinogenic Potential for exposure to radon and uranium, especially during construction	Resource Report 6, Section 6.3.4. <i>Potential for radon exposure will be included in final RR6</i> Resource Report 11, Section 11.3	Measures to protect the public are described in Section 11.3 of the draft Resource Report 11. MVP does not expect that construction and operation of the Project will result in potential for exposure to uranium. See Resource Report 6. Section 6.3.4. MVP does not expect that construction and operation of the Project will result in increased potential for exposure to radon. Due to the shallow nature of the excavation, radon gas, if present would rapidly vent to the atmosphere. According to OSHA Office of Health Enforcement, Richard E. Fairfax, Director; Directorate of Enforcement Programs (December 28, 2009), "Because natural ventilation dilutes radon gas levels, construction employees working at open air excavation or trenching work sites are not likely to be exposed to hazardous concentrations of radon except in rare circumstances." MVP will include in final Resource Report 6 an assessment of potential for Project construction to result in exposure to radon.
115	Multiple Individuals	Concerns regarding restricted ingress/egress from certain neighborhoods in case of an accident/emergency Required thickness of pipe in rural vs. urban areas	Resource Report 11, Section 11.1.2	During construction, MVP will take special care in residential areas to minimize neighborhood and traffic disruption. Measures to be implemented where the pipeline is near residential areas include ensuring piping is installed as quickly as reasonably possible consistent with prudent pipeline construction practices to minimize construction time affecting a neighborhood, and conducting work so emergency vehicles will be able to pass at all times and to limit disruption of access to residential driveways.  Section 11.1.2 in draft Resource Report 11 describes the USDOT Minimum Federal Safety Standards (49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 192) that defines the required pipe thickness for each Class Location, which is defined by population density. In general, more stringent pipeline design, wall thickness, testing, and operation characteristics are required in more populated areas.
116	Preserve Roanoke Multiple Individuals	Threat of terrorism attack, accidental damage from hunters	NA	MVP believes that the threat of a terrorist attack on the proposed facilities is an extremely remote and unlikely event. The pipeline will be buried to meet minimum requirements of the USDOT, which will be a minimum of 3 feet in soil and 2 feet where consolidated rock is encountered. This burial depth, combined with the thickness of the steel pipe, will be sufficient to protect the pipeline from stray bullets that may be fired by hunters.

## Response to Scoping Comments

Number	Source Name <sup>1</sup>	Issue of Concern	Addressed in Reports	Response
117	Multiple Individuals	Liability in case of an accident (injury, damage to property/livestock, displacement)	NA	In the unlikely event of a serious incident, MVP will have adequate insurance in place to provide sufficient protection.
118	WVDNR Multiple Individuals	Forest fires	Resource Report 11, Section 11.3	In the event a fire was to occur on the surface in the vicinity of MVP's underground pipeline, the presence of the pipeline would not increase fire hazards. Fires on the surface are not a direct threat to underground natural gas pipelines because of the insulating effects of soil cover over the pipeline. Soil is a poor conductor of heat with thermal conductivity values ranging from 0.44 to 1.44 Btu/ft-hr-°F. The heat capacity of most soils is 0.20 to 0.25 Btu/lb-°F. Based on the proposed burial depth of 24 to 36 inches, and the insulating effects of soil cover over the pipeline, MVP does not believe that forest fires would affect pipeline integrity.
119	Multiple Individuals	Ability to withstand major flooding, potential for pipeline to shift	<i>Additional information will be included in Section 1.4.1 of Final RR1</i>	At river crossings where flooding is possible, the pipeline will be designed and constructed to allow safe operation in the event of a major flood event. This will include weighting of the pipeline and burial at sufficient depth to avoid possible damage as a result of a flood event.
120	County Commission of Summers County Preserve Giles County Multiple Individuals	Safety concerns with regards to proximity to schools including Panther Creek Elementary School, Greenbrier Academy for Girls, James Monroe High School, Eastern Elementary Middle School, and Giles County's elementary-middle schools	Resource Report 8, Section 8.1.3.7  Resource Report 11, Section 11.3	MVP has attempted to site the Project to avoid schools and high population areas to the extent possible. MVP is committed to safely operating and maintaining the Project and will instill the existing corporate risk management philosophies of its parent companies to efficiently identify and control or eliminate hazards throughout the life of the pipeline. The Project facilities will fully adhere to Part 192 regulatory requirements pertaining to pipeline safety. These safety regulations will be reinforced by the comprehensive and strictly-enforced corporate practices of MVP. Measures to protect the public are described in Section 11.3 of the draft Resource Report 11.  Special land uses include areas such as land associated with schools, parks, places of worship, cemeteries, sports facilities, campgrounds, golf courses, and recreational fields. Special land uses within 0.5 mile of the proposed centerline are discussed in Section 8.1.3.7 of draft Resource Report 8 which will be updated in MVP's application to the FERC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project crosses Canvas Nettie Road approximately 0.25 mile west of Panther Creek Elementary School in Nicholas County, West Virginia.</li> <li>• The Project crosses Route 3 approximately 0.5 mile west of Greenbrier Academy for Girls in Summers County, West Virginia.</li> <li>• The Project is approximately 0.9 miles west of James Monroe High School in Lindsie, WV</li> <li>• Eastern Elementary/Middle School is approximately one mile southwest of the currently proposed pipeline alignment for each of the school locations identified in Pembroke, Giles County, VA.</li> <li>• Eastern Montgomery Elementary and High Schools are approximately two miles southwest/west of the proposed pipeline alignment in Elliston, VA.</li> <li>• Eastern Middle School in Pembroke, VA is the closest middle school identified to the proposed pipeline within Giles County. Giles County High School and Macy McClagherty Combined are greater than two miles south of the proposed pipeline alignment in Pearisburg, VA.</li> </ul> Impacts to these schools are not anticipated during construction or operation of the Project.
121	Multiple Individuals	Potential for major health impacts for people living in close proximity to compressor stations (see report by Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project, 2015)	<i>Will be included in Final RR5 and 9</i>	The potential for health impacts will be addressed in the final Resource Report 5 and Resource Report 9 included with MVP's application to FERC. MVP will obtain necessary air permits from the relevant state regulatory authorities for the Project.

**List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AEEI	Advanced Energy Economy Institute
AFD	Agricultural and Forestal District
APE	Area of Potential Effects
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
ATV	all terrain vehicle
ATWS	additional temporary workspace(s)
Bcf	billion cubic feet
BMPs	best management practices
Btu/ft-hr-°F	British thermal units per foot hour degrees Fahrenheit
Btu/lb-°F	British thermal units per pound degrees Fahrenheit
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWD	Chronic Wasting Disease
DCR	Department of Conservation and Recreation
DNH	Division of Natural History
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
E&SCP	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
EI	Environmental Inspector
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQT	EQT Corporation
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
HDD	horizontal directional drilling
INGAA	Interstate Natural Gas Association of America
KOPs	key observation points
LDCs	local distribution companies
LNG	liquefied natural gas
MAOP	maximum allowable operating pressure
MP	milepost
MVP	Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
NA	Not Addressed
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NGA	Natural Gas Act
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places

## Response to Scoping Comments

OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Plan	FERC's May 2013 version of the Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan
Plum Creek	Plum Creek Timberlands L.P.
Procedures	FERC's May 2013 version of the Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures
Project	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project
PRR	Planning and Recreational Resources
PSD	Public Services District
ROW	right-of-way
SPCC Plan	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan
SSURGO	Soil Survey Geographic
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Society
VDCR	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
VDEQ	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
VDGIF	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
VDHR	Virginia Department of Historic Resources
Warrior	Warrior Energy Resources, LLC
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WVDCH	West Virginia Division of Culture and History
WVDEP	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
WVDNR	West Virginia Division of Natural Resources

Document Content(s)

PF15-3 - Cover letter for response to scoping.PDF.....1-1  
Response to MVP Scoping Comments\_Final\_6-30-15.PDF.....2-29