



Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources

October 2015

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Resource Report 4 – Cultural Resources

Resource Report 4 Filing Requirements	
Information	Location in Resource Report
Minimum Filing Requirements	
<p>1. Resource Report 4 must contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the applicant's initial cultural resources consultation, including consultations with Native Americans and other interested persons (if appropriate) • Overview and Survey Reports, as appropriate • Evaluation Report, as appropriate • Treatment Plan, as appropriate <p>Written comments from State Historic Preservation Officer(s) (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO), as appropriate, and applicable land-managing agencies on the reports listed above. (§ 380.12(f)(1)(i-v))</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Section 4.3, 4.4, Reports: Appendices 4-A, 4-H2, 4-H3, 4-N, 4-O, 4-T, 4-U</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Correspondence: 4J,4-V</p> <p>Other survey reports are under development, and will be provided along with any evaluation reports and treatment plans</p>
<p>2. Initial filing requirements. The initial application must include the Documentation of initial cultural resource consultation, the Overview and Survey Reports, if required, and written comments from SHPOs, THPOs and land-managing agencies, if available. The initial cultural resources consultations should establish the need for surveys. If surveys are deemed necessary by the consultation with the SHPO/THPO, the survey report must be filed with the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the comments of the SHPOs, THPOs, or land-management agencies are not available at the time the application is filed, they may be filed separately, but they must be filed before a final certificate is issued. • If landowners deny access to private property and certain areas are not surveyed, the unsurveyed area must be identified by mileposts, and supplemental surveys or evaluations shall be conducted after access is granted. In such circumstances, reports, and treatment plans, if necessary, for those inaccessible lands may be filed after a certificate is issued. (§ 380.12(f)(2)(i-ii)) 	<p style="text-align: center;">Section 4.3, 4.4, Reports: Appendices 4-A, 4-H2, 4-H3, 4-N, 4-O, 4-T, 4-U</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Correspondence: 4J,4-V</p> <p>Other survey reports are under development, and will be provided along with any evaluation reports and treatment plans</p>
<p>3. The Evaluation Report and Treatment Plan, if required, for the entire project must be filed before a final certificate is issued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Evaluation Report may be combined in a single synthetic report with the Overview and Survey Reports if the SHPOs, THPOs, and land-management agencies allow and if it is available at the time the application is filed. • In preparing the Treatment Plan, the applicant must consult with the Commission staff, the SHPO, and any applicable THPO and land-management agencies. • Authorization to implement the Treatment Plan will occur only after the final certificate is issued. (§ 380.12(f)(3)(i-iii)) 	<p style="text-align: center;">If required, will be provided when available</p>
<p>4. Applicant must request privileged treatment for all material filed with the Commission containing location, character, and ownership information about cultural resources in accordance with Sec. 388.112 of this chapter. The cover and relevant pages or portions of the report should be clearly labeled in bold lettering: "CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION--DO NOT RELEASE." (§ 380.12(f)(4))</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>
<p>5. Except as specified in a final Commission order, or by the Director of the Office of Pipeline Regulation, construction may not begin until all cultural resource reports and plans have been approved. (§ 380.12(f)(5))</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>

**FERC Environmental Information Request for Resource Report 4
Dated August 11, 2015**

Request	Location in Resource Report
<p>1. Stakeholders have identified the following National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed Historic Districts or other NRHP listed or potentially eligible properties in the vicinity of the pipeline route or alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a Civil War camp at Ford Hollow, Greenbrier County, WV; b. Cook's Old Mill, Monroe County, WV; c. Cook's Fort, Monroe County, WV; d. Woods Fort, Monroe County, WV; e. Red Sulphur Springs Resort, Monroe County, WV; f. McClung's Mill, Monroe County, WV; g. Reed's Gist Mill, Monroe County, WV; h. Hanging Rock Observatory on Peters Mountain, Monroe County, WV; i. Elmwood, Monroe County, WV; j. Sweet Springs Resort, Monroe County, WV; k. Sinks Grove, Monroe County, WV; l. Old Rehoboth Church, Monroe County, WV; m. New Zion Church, Monroe County, WV; n. Waiteville Christian Church, Monroe County, WV; o. Potts Valley Railroad, Monroe County, WV; p. Indian Creek Bridge, Monroe County, WV; q. Laurel Creek Bridge, Monroe County, WV; r. Union Historic District, Monroe County, WV; s. Pickaway Rural Historic District, Monroe County, WV; t. Alderson Historic District, Monroe County, WV u. Colonel Gwin Plantation, Summers County, WV; v. Colonel James Graham Home, Summers County, WV; w. Pence Springs Hotel Historic District, Summers County, WV; x. Pence Springs prehistoric archaeological site complex, Summers County, WV; y. Salt Sulphur Spring Historic District, Summers County, WV; z. prehistoric archaeological sites along the New River, Giles County, VA; aa. Greater Newport Rural Historic District, Giles County, VA; bb. two historic covered bridges near Newport, VA; cc. a Civil War cemetery along Alternative 210; dd. North Fork Valley Rural Historic District, Montgomery County, VA; ee. Cahas Mountain Rural Historic District, Franklin County, VA; and ff. Bowman Farm, Franklin County, VA. <p>Include a table that lists all of these above sites, by county/state, ownership, MP location, NRHP-status, and provides the distance (in feet) between each site and the closest construction work area for the Project. Outline measures that Mountain Valley would implement to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on these sites.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.1, Table 4.1-4, Section 4.1.2.1, and Table 4.1-10</p>

**FERC Environmental Information Request for Resource Report 4
Dated August 11, 2015**

Request	Location in Resource Report
<p>2. Define the "indirect" area of potential effect (APE) in relation to distance away from the proposed construction right-of-way. We suggest that the indirect APE should be 0.25-mile away from the pipeline and 0.5-mile away from all aboveground facilities. In addition, section 4.3.2 states "Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) requested minor modifications to the indirect affects APE and in response MVP will update the APE and the maps on which it is displayed and resubmit the draft plan for final approval." Revise section 4.3.2 to include the updated APE and VDHR approval.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.1 and Section 4.1.2.1</p>
<p>3. Include the dates when the site file searches were conducted by Mountain Valley at the West Virginia Division of Cultural and History and the VDHR. The site file searches should be updated to August 2015.</p>	<p>These are current through September 2015</p>
<p>4. Based on the site file search, include a list of all archaeological surveys previously conducted within 0.5-mile of the proposed facilities. The list should include the project name, state/county, date of the survey, company-investigator, acres inventoried, and sites recorded. Identify if any previous surveys overlap the direct APE.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.1 and Section 4.1.2.1 Tables 4.1-2 and 4.1-7</p>
<p>5. Based on the site file search, include a list of all previously recorded archaeological sites and historic standing structures (houses, bridges, etc.) within 0.5-mile of the proposed facilities. The list should include the site number-name, type, distance (in feet) from edge of the construction work area, recorder-report reference, NRHP evaluation, and SHPO opinion and date of review. Superimpose the locations of all previously recorded archaeological sites and historic standing structures within the indirect APE on copies of 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps with the pipeline and aboveground facilities.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.1 and Section 4.1.2.1 Appendices 4-B1, 4-B2, 4-B3, 4-C1, 4-C2,</p>
<p>6. Indicate the organizations and individuals who requested to be consulting parties that have executed a confidentiality agreement with Mountain Valley (and the date of signature).</p>	<p>Section 4.2</p>
<p>7. Include copies of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Archaeology and Historic Architecture West Virginia Work Plan; b. Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Archaeology and Historic Architecture Virginia Work Plan; c. Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Archaeological Sensitivity Model: Giles, Montgomery, Franklin, and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia; and d. Historic Architecture Background Research Letter Report. <p>Document that Mountain Valley's cultural resources survey strategies and work plans were submitted to the State Historic Preservation Offices of West Virginia and Virginia, Indian tribes that may attach religious or cultural importance to properties within the APE, and appropriate consulting parties, and file all comments on the plans.</p>	<p>Work Plans: Appendices 4-K, 4-L1, 4-L2, 4-P; Sensitivity Model: Appendix 4-Q; Background Letter Report: Appendix 4-R</p>
<p>8. Include the updated Archeological Sensitivity Model and Unanticipated Discoveries Plan requested by the VDHR in its March 2, 2015 letter.</p>	<p>Sensitivity Model: Appendix 4-Q; Unanticipated Discoveries Plan: Appendix 4-M</p>

FERC Environmental Information Request for Resource Report 4 Dated August 11, 2015		
	Request	Location in Resource Report
9.	Include copies of the Project-specific cultural resources Overview and Survey reports that cover the entire direct APE in West Virginia and Virginia and meet the requirements outlined in sections V. and VI. of the FERC's Office of Energy Projects Guidelines for Reporting on Cultural Resources Investigations for Pipeline Projects (December 2002 version). Document that Mountain Valley also submitted copies of these reports to the appropriate SHPOs, interested Indian tribes, and other consulting parties, and file comments on the reports.	Reports: Appendices 4-A, 4-H2, 4-H3, 4-N, 4-O, 4-T, 4-U Correspondence: Appendix 4-J and 4-V
10.	Mountain Valley stated that staff from the U.S. Forest Service (FS) conducted an archaeological survey of Project components within the Jefferson National Forest. Include a copy of the FS survey report.	Section 4.3.3
11.	Include correspondence discussed in RR4 from the FS and the U.S. National Park Service.	Appendix 4-J
12.	Include a detailed discussion of "cultural attachment" along the proposed pipeline route crossing the Jefferson National Forest. The study of cultural attachment should be conducted by a qualified professional cultural anthropologist.	Section 4.3.3
13.	Include comments from interested Indian tribes not documented on table 4.4-1 or not previously filed with the FERC.	Appendix 4-V
14.	Identify if blasting would be conducted near any historic structures. If so, describe the potential impacts that blasting and vibrations could have on those structures, and outline measures Mountain Valley would implement to reduce those impacts.	Section 4.1.1.2 and 4.1.2.2

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Comments on Resource Report 4		
Page/Section	Request	Location in Resource Report
General	Potential impacted resources (direct and/or indirect) should be depicted on a map with the proposed pipeline right-of-way to allow for a visual of the project in relations to resources.	Appendices: 4B2 and 4-E
General	Section 4.3, Agency Consultation, references correspondence initiated to and from agencies, particularly the SHPOs—West Virginia Division of Culture and History (WVDCH) and Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR). It is assumed that the correspondence will be provided in Appendix 4-A, Agency Correspondence. The text should indicate that referenced correspondence is in Appendix 4-A, Agency Correspondence.	Appendix 4-J
General	In addition, Section 4.4, Native American Consultation, also references correspondence to and from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and tribes. EPA appreciates the contacts table provided in Table 4.4-1, Contacts with Federally-Recognized Native American Tribes, that provides a summary of the responses. However, the letter of correspondence should be included as a record in the NEPA document. Again, although it may be assumed that the correspondence will be included in Appendix 4-A, it should be stated in the text that correspondence can be found in the Appendix.	Appendix 4-J
4-2 through 4-5	These pages indicate sites (within WV and VA) that have not been evaluated for the potential to meet the criteria to be eligible to the NRHP. Please address whether these sites will be evaluated and if no evaluation is planned then provide reason (for no evaluation).	Section 4.1.1 and 4.1.2

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Comments on Resource Report 4		
Page/Section	Request	Location in Resource Report
4-3 and 4-6	The Construction and Operation Impacts sections for WV and VA discusses the goal to avoid adverse effects to NRHP-listed and eligible cultural resources and that indirect effects may be in the form of potential partial views of the Project. As the Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) moves along in the NEPA process, formal documentation should identify potential resources that may be impacted (direct or indirect) and visuals should be provided, if feasible, in the report.	Noted and In Progress
4-7	This resource report should indicate where MVP addresses concerns of the Appalachian Trail in other resource reports so that the public/reader can find it easily.	See also Resource Report 8
4-7	Section 4.2, Regulatory Requirements, states "Another concern brought to the attention of FERC and MVP is possible impact to the cultural attachment local people have to their land in areas of Monroe County." In addition, "MVP continues to work with local stakeholders to site the Project in a way that would minimize effects to stakeholders' cultural attachment." The NEPA documentation should identify who the local stakeholders are and discuss how the local people are engaged to fully understand the cultural attachment and to best address potential impacts and avoidance.	Section 4.3.3

RESOURCE REPORT 4 CULTURAL RESOURCES TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4-1
PURPOSE OF REPORT.....	4-1
REPORT ORGANIZATION.....	4-1
4.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS	4-2
4.1.1 West Virginia.....	4-3
4.1.1.1 Existing Resources	4-3
4.1.1.2 Construction and Operational Effects.....	4-8
4.1.2 Virginia.....	4-9
4.1.2.1 Existing Resources	4-9
4.1.2.2 Construction and Operation Effects	4-16
4.2 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.....	4-17
4.3 AGENCY CONSULTATIONS.....	4-18
4.3.1 West Virginia Division of Culture and History	4-18
4.3.2 Virginia Department of Historic Resources.....	4-19
4.3.3 United States Forest Service	4-20
4.3.5 Curatorial Facilities.....	4-21
4.4 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION.....	4-21
4.5 PLAN FOR UNANTICIPATED HISTORIC PROPERTIES AND HUMAN REMAINS.....	4-22
4.6 REFERENCES	4-22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1-1	Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources in West Virginia Within One Mile and 0.5 Mile of the Project.....	4-3
Table 4.1-2	Previously Conducted Archaeological Surveys within 0.5 Mile of Proposed Facilities in West Virginia	4-4
Table 4.1-3	WVDCH Evaluation of Previously Recorded Aboveground Resources in West Virginia Located Within 0.5 Mile of the Project	4-6
Table 4.1-4	National Register Historic Districts and Other NRHP-Listed or Potentially Eligible Properties Identified by Stakeholders in West Virginia.....	4-7
Table 4.1-5	Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources in Virginia Within One Mile and 0.5 Mile of the Project	4-10
Table 4.1-6	VDHR Evaluation of Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources Located Within One Mile and 0.5 Mile of the Project in Virginia	4-10
Table 4.1-7	Archaeological Surveys and Reports of Projects within 0.5-Mile of Project in Virginia	4-11

Table 4.1-8	Previously Recorded Aboveground Resources in Virginia Within One Mile of the Project	4-14
Table 4.1-9	VDHR Evaluation of Previously Recorded Aboveground Resources in Virginia Located Within One Mile and 0.5-Mile of the Project	4-14
Table 4.1-10	Previously Recorded National Register Historic Districts Within One Mile of the Project in Virginia.....	4-15
Table 4.2-1	Organizations and People Who Requested Consulting Party Status	4-18

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 4-A	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Overview Report
Appendix 4-B1	Archaeological Sites Recorded within WVDCH Files [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-B2	Map Showing Archaeological and Historic Sites Within 0.5 Mile of Project in West Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-B3	Archaeological Resources Located within the Direct Effects APE in West Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-C1	Summary of Aboveground Cultural Resources Recorded in WVDCH Site Files within 0.5 Mile of the Project in West Virginia
Appendix 4-C2	Summary of Aboveground Cultural Resources Recorded within the Direct and Indirect Effects APE in West Virginia
Appendix 4-D1	Mountain Valley Pipeline, Phase IA Archaeological Background Study, Giles, Craig, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia
Appendix 4-D2	Archaeological Sites in V-CRIS Files Located Within 0.5 Mile of Project in Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-E	National Register of Historic Places & Virginia Department of Historic Resources Data within 0.5 Mile of the MVP Project Overview Map [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-F	Archaeological Resources Located Within Direct Effects APE in Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-G	Aboveground Resources Recorded in V-CRIS Located Within 0.5 Mile of Project in Virginia
Appendix 4-H1	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Revised Indirect Effects APE in Virginia
Appendix 4-H2	Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Pittsylvania County, Virginia
Appendix 4-H3	Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Franklin County, Virginia
Appendix 4-I	Summary of Aboveground Historic Cultural Resources Survey Findings and Recommendations in Virginia
Appendix 4-J	Agency Correspondence
Appendix 4-K	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan
Appendix 4-L1	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan Amendment 1
Appendix 4-L2	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan Amendment 2

Appendix 4-M	Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia
Appendix 4-N	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Survey, Volume I, Wetzel, Harrison, Doddridge, and Lewis Counties, West Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-O	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Survey, Volume II, Braxton and Webster Counties, West Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-P	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, Virginia Work Plan
Appendix 4-Q	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeological Sensitivity Model, Giles, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-R	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Historic Architecture Background Research Letter Report, Virginia
Appendix 4-S	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Draft Indirect Effects APE, Virginia
Appendix 4-T	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report, Pittsylvania, County, Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-U	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report, Franklin County, Virginia [Privileged Information]
Appendix 4-V	Contacts with Federally-Recognized and State-Recognized Tribes

RESOURCE REPORT 4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ANST	Appalachian National Scenic Trail
APE	area of potential effects
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
MVP	Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
Project	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Office
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
V-CRIS	Virginia Cultural Resources Information System
VDHR	Virginia Department of Historic Resources
VMNH	Virginia Museum of Natural History
WVDCH	West Virginia Division of Culture and History

RESOURCE REPORT 4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Introduction

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC (MVP), a joint venture between EQT Midstream Partners, LP and affiliates of NextEra Energy, Inc., WGL Holdings, Inc., Vega Energy Partners, Ltd., and RGC Midstream, LLC, is seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act authorizing it to construct and operate the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline Project (Project) located in 17 counties in West Virginia and Virginia. MVP plans to construct an approximately 301-mile, 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline to provide timely, cost-effective access to the growing demand for natural gas for use by local distribution companies, industrial users and power generation in the Mid-Atlantic and southeastern markets, as well as potential markets in the Appalachian region.

The proposed pipeline will extend from the existing Equitrans, L.P. transmission system and other natural gas facilities in Wetzel County, West Virginia to Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC's Zone 5 compressor station 165 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia. In addition to the pipeline, the Project will include approximately 171,600 horsepower of compression at three compressor stations currently planned along the route, as well as measurement, regulation, and other ancillary facilities required for the safe and reliable operation of the pipeline. The pipeline is designed to transport up to 2.0 million dekatherms per day of natural gas. Resource Report 1 provides a complete summary of the Project facilities (see Table 1.2-2) and a general location map of the Project facilities (Figure 1.2-1).

Purpose of Report

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on cultural resource sites that are listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The purpose of this report is to identify and describe the cultural resources present within the Project area and the potential effects associated with these resources from construction, operation and maintenance of Project facilities. Resource Report 4 provides data sufficient to determine the expected effects of the Project, and effectiveness of measures that will be incorporated by MVP to avoid or minimize those effects.

Report Organization

Resource Report 4 is prepared and organized according to the FERC *Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation* (August 2002). This report comprises five major sections and a separate section listing the sources used as its basis. Section 4.1 describes the existing cultural resources within the Project's area of potential effects (APE), the construction and operational effects, and mitigation of effects; Section 4.2 describes the regulatory requirements; Section 4.3 addresses agency consultations; Section 4.4 discusses Native American consultation; Section 4.5 discusses the unanticipated discovery plan developed for the Project; and Section 4.6 presents the list of references that formed the basis for Resource Report 4.

4.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

Cultural resources include archaeological sites, historic standing structures, objects, districts, traditional cultural properties, and other properties that illuminate important aspects of prehistory or history or have important and long-standing cultural associations with established communities or social groups. Significant archaeological and architectural properties are generally identified using the eligibility criteria for listing in the NRHP, and in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) of the respective states through which a project traverses. The SHPO offices in West Virginia and Virginia are housed at the West Virginia Division of Culture and History (WVDCH) and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR), respectively.

In accordance with guidelines of West Virginia, Virginia, and FERC, the APE for direct effects was determined to include all areas where ground disturbing activities may take place. The APE for direct effects includes a 300-foot study corridor in which MVP will bury the proposed pipeline in a portion of the study area. Within this corridor, a 125-foot total easement would include temporary construction areas and extra workspaces. In addition, approximately 50 feet of the total easement would be permanently maintained. The direct effects APE also includes Project-related facilities outside of the corridor (such as access roads and compressor stations) that would be modified.

The APE for indirect effects generally relates to aboveground resources including historic structures and landscapes. The indirect effects APE includes those areas where the character of a historic property's use or setting that contributes to its historic significance may be permanently disturbed; where the character of the property's use or physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance may be changed; where the property is removed from its historic location; or locations where the introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features. In consultation with WVDCH, MVP defined the indirect APE in West Virginia as 0.25 mile on either side of the Project centerline. In the areas of the three proposed compressor stations, the indirect effects APE is defined as 0.5-mile radius around each compressor station footprint.

In Virginia, the indirect effects APE, defined in consultation with VDHR, was based on elevation analysis that took into account topography and current land use around the pipeline. The APE is, at a minimum, defined as a 450-foot corridor centered on either side of the pipeline centerline. In some areas, the APE for indirect effects expands beyond 450 feet to take into account the longer viewing distances that exist at higher elevations. In the expanded areas, the APE is up to one mile on either side of the pipeline. In general, the APE is narrower in the eastern counties and widens in response to topography in the westernmost counties of the Project route in Virginia.

The Cultural Resources Overview Report (Tetra Tech 2015k) is included in Appendix 4-A. The report includes summaries of cultural resources background information, the cultural resources investigations performed to date, historic contexts, various consultations, and recommendations for additional work. Archaeological and historic architectural surveys are ongoing and reports that will be prepared for these surveys will be filed with FERC as they become available. Similarly, as comments are received from respective SHPO offices, these will be filed with FERC.

4.1.1 West Virginia

4.1.1.1 Existing Resources

MVP reviewed archaeological and historic architecture site files maintained by the WVDCH in January 2015 and again in September 2015. These reviews of site files indicated 123 archaeological resources recorded within one mile of the Project, of which 19 are within 0.5 mile of the Project. A range of cultural time periods from the prehistoric Woodland period through the modern historic period are represented. Some of the site types identified include camp sites, lithic scatters, habitations, villages, hunting camps, and occupations of rock shelters. Resources that have been identified include domestic sites; cemeteries; military camps; Civil War battlegrounds; and archaeological resources associated with historic summer resorts, plantations, pioneer/settler cabins, and farmsteads. Of the sites within one mile of the Project, 66 sites relate to prehistoric time periods, 24 are related to historic time periods, 8 sites include both prehistoric and historic period cultural materials, and 25 sites cannot be chronologically or culturally attributed (Table 4.1-1). Within 0.5 mile of the Project, there are 10 prehistoric period sites, 2 sites with both prehistoric and historic components, 6 historic period sites, and 1 site that cannot be assigned a time period. WVDCH has not reviewed these sites for their potential to meet the criteria to be eligible to the NRHP.

County	Prehistoric Sites		Prehistoric and Historic		Historic Sites		Unknown Time Period		Total Archaeology Sites	
	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile
Wetzel	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	5	3
Harrison	4	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	10	0
Doddridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Braxton	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1
Webster	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Nicholas	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
Greenbrier	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Fayette	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summers	15	4	2	0	9	1	16	0	42	5
Monroe	40	4	4	2	4	0	7	1	55	7
Total Sites	66	10	8	2	24	6	25	1	123	19

Table 4.1-2 lists surveys that have been previously performed within 0.5 mile of the Project facilities. Four surveys (Sanderson and Corle 2004; Gozdik and White 1994; Meece 2008; and Orr 2001) crossed the APE for the Project and reported seven sites within 0.5 mile of the Project. Three additional surveys seem to have crossed the Project, but there are no reports on file providing detail about the results of these surveys.

Table 4.1-2

Previously Conducted Archaeological Surveys within 0.5 Mile of Proposed Facilities in West Virginia

Author /Year	Title / Affiliation	CRM_ID	Total Survey Area	Archaeological Sites within 0.5 Mile	APE Crossing	Map Page Number Appendix 4-B2
2000 / Smith, Aaron, O. and Karen E, Hudson	Cultural Resource Analysts Inc. Phase I Archaeological Survey for a Proposed Cell Tower Project on Tulley Ridge, Lewis County, West Virginia	00-895-LE	0.23 acres	None	No	13
2000/ Smith, Aaron, O. and Karen E, Hudson	Cultural Resource Analysts Inc. Abbreviated Report for Phase I Archaeological Survey of a Proposed Cell Tower Near Lawn, Summers County, West Virginia	00-921-GB	0.35 acres	None	No	34
2007/ Moon, Ginny	Environmental Corporation pf America / Archaeological Assessment TCNS ID 26635 Proposed 300 feet Lattice Type Telecommunications Structure	07-1159-SU	0.25 acres	46SU183	No	34
2011 / Baker Jason, A.	Cultural Resource Analysts Inc. Archaeological Identification Survey for the Proposed 82 East Surface Mine, Glade District, Webster County, West Virginia	11-81-WB-1	52.4 acres	46WB361	No	21
2004 / Sanderson Stevens, A. and Brian Corle	John Millner & Associates / Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Transmission Line Corridor Western Greenbrier Co-Production Project, Greenbrier and Nicholas County, West Virginia	04-705-GB-1	17 linear miles at select tower locations	46NI655	Yes	31
No Report on File	NA	89-1168-MULTI	Approximately 10 linear miles	46BX46	No	17
No Reports on File	NA	14-411-WB	Approximately 15 linear miles	None	Yes	20
No Report on File	NA	14-525-MULTI-4	unknown	46WZ78/79	No	1
No Report on File	NA	12-454-HS	Approximately 27 acres	None	Yes	9

Table 4.1-2

Previously Conducted Archaeological Surveys within 0.5 Mile of Proposed Facilities in West Virginia

Author /Year	Title / Affiliation	CRM_ID	Total Survey Area	Archaeological Sites within 0.5 Mile	APE Crossing	Map Page Number Appendix 4-B2
1992/Ballweber, Hettie L.	NPW Consultants/ Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Seven CNG Transmission Corporation Natural Gas Facilities, Harrison and Lewis Counties, West Virginia	92-1217-MULTI	4.1 acres	None	No	11
1992/Ballweber, Hettie L.	NPW Consultants/ Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the CNG Transmission Corporation TL-344 Pipeline Project, Lewis County, West Virginia	92-1186-LE	unknown	None	No	11
No Report on File	NA	01-378-MULTI	unknown	unknown	No	11
No Report on File	NA	97-152-WB	approximately 4,000 acres	46WM361	Yes	21
2012/Vossick, James and Christopher Jackson	Archaeological Consultants of the Midwest, Inc./ A phase I Archaeological Literature Review and Reconnaissance Survey for the Proposed Robinson Run Mine -7 North Portal Projects in Harrison and Wetzel Counties, West Virginia	12-681-MULTI	96.3 acres	None	No	---
1994/ Gozdzik, Gloria and J.J. White	Horizon Research Consultants / A Cultural Resource Report for Juliana Mining Lower Laurel	94-236-WB	approximately 1,000 acres	46WB42, 46WB43, 46WB44, 46WB45, 46WB46	Yes	---
2008 / Meece Jamie, S.	Cultural Resources Analysts / Abbreviated Technical Report Archaeological Survey of the Craigsville / 416452 Telecommunications Tower Site, Nicholas County, West Virginia	08-1466-NI	0.42 acres	None	Yes	23
2001/ Orr, Michael L.	Cultural Resources Analysts, Inc. / Abbreviated Report for Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Surbaugh Cell Tower Site, Summers County, West Virginia	01-409-SU	0.23 acres	46SU183	Yes	34

Appendix 4-B1 includes a list of sites recorded within WVDCH site files that are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. Appendix 4-B2 contains a mapbook with the locations of archaeological sites and aboveground resources that are recorded in the WVDCH site files within 0.5 mile of the Project and includes a depiction of the Project facilities.

MVP archaeological surveys are ongoing to identify archaeological cultural resources located within the APE for direct effects. As of September 11, 2015, the archaeological survey has been completed within approximately 146 miles of the pipeline (approximately 75 percent of the route in West Virginia). In addition, approximately 75 miles of access roads have also been surveyed in West Virginia. Reports of cultural resources survey in West Virginia, including both archaeology and historic architecture, have been provided to WVDCH to date in two volumes (Tetra Tech 2015h and Tetra Tech 2015i). A third volume will cover the remaining counties in West Virginia and will be submitted to WVDCH for review and filed with FERC once completed.

Appendix 4-B3 represents the results of the archaeological surveys performed by MVP in West Virginia, as reported to WVDCH by date of this report. Surveys are currently in progress in West Virginia and additional information will be filed with FERC when it is available.

WVDCH site files indicated 381 previously recorded aboveground resources within one mile of the Project. One of these resources, the NRHP-listed Weston and Gauley Bridge Turnpike (NR#98001430), is located within the APE for direct effects. Of these resources, 351 have not been evaluated for their potential to meet criteria to be eligible to the NRHP, 15 have been determined not eligible to the NRHP, 5 are contributing resources to potential historic districts, 4 have been determined by WVDCH to be eligible to the NRHP, 5 are listed in the NRHP, and 1 is an unevaluated Civil War site that comprises a potentially significant landscape.

A total of 46 of the 381 previously recorded aboveground resources are located within 0.5 mile of the Project, including 43 resources that have not been evaluated for NRHP-eligibility, 2 resources listed in the NRHP, and 1 Civil War site that has not been evaluated for the NRHP. A summary of WVDCH’s NRHP evaluations of these previously recorded aboveground resources in West Virginia is provided in Table 4.1-3.

WVDCH Determination of NRHP Eligibility	Number of Resources
Not Evaluated	43
Not Eligible	0
Contributing Resource to Potential Historic District	0
Eligible	0
Listed	2
Civil War Site – Not Evaluated	1
Total Aboveground Resources	46

In letters filed with FERC, stakeholders expressed specific concern about a number of cultural resources that are listed in the NRHP individually or as NRHP Districts and others that are potentially eligible to the NRHP. Table 4.1-4 lists these cultural resources and indicates their distance from the nearest Project workspace.

County	Identifier	NRHP Status	Distance from Project Work Space (miles)	Nearest Milepost	Measures to Avoid, Minimize, or Mitigate Effects
Greenbrier	A Civil War Camp at Ford Hollow	Not Evaluated	1.35	160.7	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Cook's Old Mill	NRHP-Listed	0.82	182.5	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Cook's Fort	Not Evaluated	4.83	183.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Woods Fort	Not Evaluated	2.01	194.3	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Red Sulphur Springs Resort	Not Evaluated	2.5	184.4	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	McClung's Mill	Not Evaluated	3.89	185.6	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Reed's Grist Mill	NRHP-Listed	9.31	175.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Hanging Rock Observatory on Peters Mountain	Not Evaluated	11.2	188.3	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Elmwood	NRHP-Listed	6.13	173.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Old Sweet Springs Resort	NRHP-Listed	20.5	175.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Sinks Grove	Not Evaluated	5.56	161.5	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Old Rehoboth Church	Not Evaluated	6.16	175.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	New Zion Church	Not Evaluated	9.44	216.7	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Waiteville Christian Church	Not Evaluated	9.39	216.7	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Potts Valley Railroad	Not Evaluated	8.7	216.7	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Indian Creek Bridge	NRHP-Listed	3.62	174	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Laurel Creek Bridge	NRHP-Listed	4.0	172.3	No Effect (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Union Historic District	NRHP-Listed	3.72	173.2	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)

County	Identifier	NRHP Status	Distance from Project Work Space (miles)	Nearest Milepost	Measures to Avoid, Minimize, or Mitigate Effects
Monroe	Pickaway Rural Historic District	NRHP-Listed	3.58	175.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Monroe	Alderson Historic District	NRHP-Listed	0.5	160.4	No Effect (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Summers	Colonel Gwin Plantation	NRHP-Listed	3.42	159.1	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Summers	Colonel James Graham Home	NRHP-Listed	5.96	167.6	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)
Summers	Pence Springs Prehistoric Archaeological Site Complex	Not Evaluated	pending	170.9	MVP will develop an avoidance plan or treatment plan if appropriate
Summers	Salt Sulphur Spring Historic District	Not Evaluated	5.02	177.7	No Effect Anticipated (outside Indirect Effects APE)

MVP’s architectural historian conducted a systematic reconnaissance-level survey to record all architectural or historic resources style-dated as 50 years old (ca. 1967) or older within the direct and indirect APE. WVDCH approved of this approach by letter on May 8, 2015. As of September 11, 2015, the architectural and historic resources survey has been completed for the indirect effects APE.

Given the remote character of the landscape, access to all properties from publicly owned rights-of-way was not possible. Resources that were inaccessible from publicly owned rights-of-way, but located within the 300-foot direct effects APE, are recorded by Tetra Tech’s archaeological field crews. Subsequently, Tetra Tech architectural historians utilize these field notes and photography to complete the appropriate architectural inventory forms and NRHP eligibility recommendations. As of September 11, 2015, the architectural and historic resources survey has been completed for approximately 75 percent of the indirect effects APE.

Appendix 4-C1 presents a summary of aboveground cultural resources located within 0.5 mile of the Project that are recorded within the WVDCH site files. Appendix 4-C2 presents the results of the architectural and historic resources survey performed for MVP as reported to WVDCH by date of this report. This table will be expanded as the results of still ongoing surveys are reported and filed with the FERC.

4.1.1.2 Construction and Operational Effects

MVP’s goal is to avoid adverse effects to NRHP-listed and -eligible cultural resources to the greatest extent possible. MVP has reviewed previously and newly recorded archaeological sites that have the potential to be NRHP-eligible and has considered route modifications that would avoid effects to these sites. MVP will request that FERC in consultation with the WVDCH issue determinations of eligibility for sites within the direct effects APE that cannot be avoided. If necessary, Phase II and Phase III (WVDCH 2001) investigations will be performed at NRHP-eligible sites that cannot be avoided by the Project. For NRHP-listed or -eligible sites that will be adversely affected by the Project, MVP will develop and implement

appropriate mitigations in consultation with the WVDCH, FERC, interested tribes, and other interested parties as required.

To the greatest extent practicable, the Project will not result in direct effects to NRHP-eligible or -listed aboveground resources as a result of Project construction and operation. Where massive bedrock is not easily removed by conventional excavation methods, MVP may use blasting to break up rock. MVP will try to minimize the amount of blasting required to the extent practicable; however, blasting may be required in certain areas of shallow bedrock. Where consolidated rock is encountered during construction, MVP's preferred procedure will be to fracture and excavate the bedrock using standard construction equipment. MVP's blasting technique would typically involve small charges strong enough to crack rock in the pipeline centerline. As currently planned, the impact of such blasting is expected to be limited to within 50 feet of the right-of-way. MVP's contractor will prepare a detailed Blasting Plan for each distinct blasting area, which will comply with all permit requirements. Structures within 150 feet, historic or not, will be evaluated for pre- and post-blasting condition. Further details regarding MVP's Blasting Plan and mitigation efforts may be found in MVP Resource Report 6.

Indirect effects are possible in the form of potential partial views of the Project. MVP's siting of the Project has taken into consideration the potential for views from NRHP-listed and -eligible resources. As possible, MVP is attempting to minimize views that would be assessed as adverse effects to significant historic properties. If the Project would result in adverse effects to aboveground resources that are listed in or are eligible to the NRHP, then appropriate mitigation will be developed and implemented in consultation with the WVDCH, FERC, interested tribes, and other interested parties as required. Sites with potential to be NRHP-eligible that cannot be avoided by the Project will be tested and evaluated for NRHP eligibility following appropriate consultations.

4.1.2 Virginia

4.1.2.1 Existing Resources

The VDHR archaeological site files are part of the state database system known as Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (V-CRIS). MVP conducted a site file search of the VDHR files in October 2014 and again in September 2015. As shown in Table 4.1-5, V-CRIS contains records for 138 archaeological sites that have been previously recorded within one mile of the Project. Of these, 97 archaeological sites are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. Eighty prehistoric sites are located within one mile of the Project and 55 of these are within 0.5 mile of the Project. Four sites that are located within one mile of the Project contain both historic and prehistoric components. Of these, two are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. Forty-nine historic sites are recorded within one mile of the Project. Of these, 38 are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. Five sites of unknown time association are located within one mile of the Project of which two are located within 0.5 mile of the Project.

Table 4.1-5

Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources in Virginia Within One Mile and 0.5 Mile of the Project

County	Prehistoric Sites		Prehistoric and Historic		Historic Sites		Unknown Time Period		Total Archaeology Sites	
	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile
Giles	8	7	0	0	14	13	2	0	24	20
Craig	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	20	13	3	1	14	10	1	1	38	25
Roanoke	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	14	0
Floyd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	31	28	1	1	7	7	2	2	41	38
Pittsylvania	9	9	0	0	12	11	0	0	21	20
Total Sites	80	57	4	2	49	41	5	3	138	103

Table 4.1-6 presents the VDHR NRHP evaluation status of the archaeological sites within one mile and 0.5 mile of the Project. V-CRIS indicates that within one mile of the Project, 123 sites have not been evaluated for the NRHP, 12 sites have been determined as not eligible to the NRHP, and 3 sites have been determined as potentially eligible to the NRHP. Within 0.5 mile of the Project, 97 sites have not been evaluated for their potential to be eligible to the NRHP criteria, 6 sites have been determined not eligible to the NRHP and no sites are noted as potentially eligible to the NRHP. A number of the unevaluated sites are located within the boundaries of NRHP-listed historic districts, but they are not themselves noted as contributing resources to those districts.

Table 4.1-6

VDHR Evaluation of Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources Located Within One Mile and 0.5 Mile of the Project in Virginia

VDHR Evaluation Status	Number of Archaeological Sites	
	1.0 Mile	0.5 Mile
Not Evaluated for NRHP	123	97
Not Eligible to NRHP	12	6
Potentially Eligible to NRHP	3	0
List in NRHP	0	0
No Information Available	0	0
Total Archaeological Resources	138	103

A number of surveys have been previously conducted in the vicinity of the Project. Previously conducted archaeological surveys within 0.5 mile of the proposed facilities are listed in Table 4.1-7. A summary of background literature and site file reviews is contained within Tetra Tech’s Phase IA report prepared for all counties within Virginia (Tetra Tech 2015j) (Appendix 4-D1).

Table 4.1-7 lists the archaeological surveys and reports for projects located within 0.5 mile of the Project in Virginia. Seven previously reported projects crossed the MVP Project.

Table 4.1-7

Archaeological Surveys and Reports of Projects within 0.5-Mile of Project in Virginia

VDHR ID	State	County	Date	Title	Author	Affiliation	Total Survey Area	APE Crossing	Archaeological Sites (0.5 mile)
VA-065	Virginia	Pittsylvania	2006	Cultural Resource Survey Potomac Expansion Project, Pittsylvania Loop, Campbell Loop, and Fairfax Replacement; Pittsylvania, Campbell, and Fairfax Counties, Virginia	Kay Simpson, Eric Voigt, Martha Bowers, Megan Rupnik, Brad Duplantis, Edward Moore, John Mullin, Tracey Jones	Gray and Pape, Inc.	150.59 ac	Crossed APE	44PY0263 44PY0275 44PY0277 44PY0278
BE-035	Virginia	Roanoke	2003	I-73 Location Study, Bedford, Botetourt, Henry, Franklin, Roanoke Counties, Virginia: Archaeological Survey	Mary Ann Holm, John Cooke, Loretta Lautzenheiser	Coastal Carolina Research	789.45 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
PY-098	Virginia	Giles	2013	Addendum Report 1, Compressor Station 166, Pittsylvania County, Phase I Cultural Resources Survey, Virginia Southside Expansion Project	Jonathan Glen	GAI Consultants, Inc.	1.1 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
BR-039	Virginia	Craig	2012	Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation Virginia Southside Expansion Project, Brunswick, Charlotte, Halifax, Mecklenburg, and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia	Jonathan Glenn, Richard Duncan, Barbara Munford, Lori Frye, Michael Kenneally, Tegan Baiocchi	GAI Consultants, Inc.	542.76 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
RN-006	Virginia	Franklin	1984	Phase I Cultural Resources Inventory of the West County Reservoir, Roanoke County, Virginia	Michael B. Barber	Radford University	17.65 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
RN-121	Virginia	Montgomery	2010	Phase I Archaeological Survey Report, Matt Funk 138kV Transmission Line Project, Roanoke County, Virginia	Eric Scuoteguazza	GAI Consultants, Inc.	10.88 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer

Table 4.1-7

Archaeological Surveys and Reports of Projects within 0.5-Mile of Project in Virginia

VDHR ID	State	County	Date	Title	Author	Affiliation	Total Survey Area	APE Crossing	Archaeological Sites (0.5 mile)
MY-009	Virginia	Montgomery	1982	A Phase I Investigation of Archaeological Resource at the Proposed Elliston--Lafayette Wastewater Facilities in Montgomery County, Virginia	Calvert W. McIlhany	Bartlett and Associates Geological Consultants	1.82 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
FV-016	Virginia	Pittsylvania	2010	Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Mid-Atlantic Connector Expansion Project, Prince William and Fairfax Counties, Virginia and Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of Two Compressor Station Expansion Sites, Fluvanna and Pittsylvania County, Virginia	Thomas Fugate, Brad McDonald, Lena Sweeten McDonald	Gray and Pape, Inc.	984.41 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 buffer
FR-005	Virginia	Montgomery	1979	A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of Locations of Proposed Water Treatment Plant Facilities for the Town of Rocky Mount, Franklin, County, Virginia	Douglas C. McLearen	Washington and Lee University	1.66 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-020	Virginia	Giles	1979	A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of a Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection System for the Communities of Lafayette and Elliston, Montgomery County, Virginia	Douglas C. McLearen	Washington and Lee University	175.69 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-021	Virginia	Giles	1980	Review and Compliance Phase I Reconnaissance Summary, Route 11, Bridge Crossing, Montgomery County, Virginia	Keith Bott	Virginia Research Center for Archaeology	0.55 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer

Table 4.1-7

Archaeological Surveys and Reports of Projects within 0.5-Mile of Project in Virginia

VDHR ID	State	County	Date	Title	Author	Affiliation	Total Survey Area	APE Crossing	Archaeological Sites (0.5 mile)
MY-047	Virginia	Franklin	1994	Phase I Cultural Resource Survey, Route 626, Montgomery County, Virginia	Virginia Busby and Leslie Bashman	Louis Berger Group (Louis Berger and Associates)	0.48 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-099	Virginia	Pittsylvania	2007	Archaeological Survey I-81 SB Truck Climbing Lanes, Montgomery County, Virginia	Edward Moore	Louis Berger Group (Louis Berger and Associates)	26.52 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-100	Virginia	Roanoke	2009	Archaeological Survey of the Route 773 (Cannery Road) Bridge Replacement Project, Montgomery County, Virginia	Bruce Penner	Virginia Department of Transportation (Highways and Transportation)	0.09 ac	Not in APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-101	Virginia	Franklin	2009	Cultural Resource Survey in Association with the Proposed Ironto/Elliston Intermodal Connector, Montgomery County, Virginia	Stuart Fiedel, Michael Yengling	Louis Berger Group (Louis Berger and Associates)	5.38 ac	Crossed APE	No sites in 0.5 mile buffer
MY-127	Virginia	Montgomery	2009	Supplemental Archaeological Survey of Proposed Storm Water Management Basin (SWM-1) in Association with the Route 603 (North Fork Road) Improvement Project, Montgomery County, Virginia	Penner, Bruce R.	Virginia Department of Transportation	Survey not mapped	Not in APE	44MY0540
Not Listed by SHPO	Virginia	Giles	1998	Archaeological Investigations on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests During Fiscal Years 1996-2000 with Appendices for 2001	Michael B. Barber, George A. Tolley, Mark A. Martin, Joel C. Hardison, Michael J. Madden	National Forest Service	Survey not mapped	Not in APE	44GS0190

Appendix 4-D2 lists the archaeological sites recorded in V-CRIS that are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. Appendix 4-E contains figures that display the locations of the archaeological sites and aboveground resources that are recorded within VDHR site files within 0.5 mile of the Project. Archaeological surveys are ongoing to identify archaeological cultural resources located within the APE for direct effects in Virginia. As of September 11, 2015, archaeological survey has been completed within approximately 56 miles of pipeline (approximately 53 percent of the route in Virginia). In addition, approximately 21 miles of access roads have also been surveyed in Virginia. Appendix 4-F lists sites that to date are known to be located within the direct effects APE in Virginia.

A search of V-CRIS revealed 329 aboveground cultural resources recorded within one mile of the Project of which 210 are located within 0.50 mile of the Project. Table 4.1-8 lists the numbers of these resources by county. Numbers of the aboveground resources are located within historic districts.

County	Number of Aboveground Resources <u>a/</u>	
	1 Mile	0.5 Mile
Giles	76	65
Craig	1	0
Montgomery	50	36
Roanoke	60	32
Floyd	3	0
Franklin	91	40
Pittsylvania	44	37
Total Sites	329	210

a/ Includes Historic Districts and individual resources that comprise the Historic Districts.

Appendix 4-G lists the aboveground resources recorded in V-CRIS that are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. VDHR evaluation of the previously recorded aboveground resources in Virginia is summarized in Table 4.1-9. Within 0.5 mile of the Project, 167 resources have not been evaluated for their potential to be eligible to the NRHP, 31 have been evaluated as not eligible, 4 resources have been determined eligible, and 8 resources have been listed in the NRHP.

VDHR Determination of NRHP Eligibility	Number of Resources	
	Within 1.0 Mile	Within 0.5 Mile
Not Evaluated	236	167
Not Eligible	69	31
Eligible	15	4
Listed	9	8
Civil War Site – Not Evaluated	0	0
Total Aboveground Resources	329	210

Eight historic districts listed in the NRHP and two historic districts that have been determined as eligible to the NRHP by VDHR are located within one mile of the Project. These are listed in Table 4.1-10. Each listed historic district and NRHP-eligible historic district comprises multiple resources that contribute to the significance of the districts. In letters filed with FERC, stakeholders expressed specific concern about some of these districts. For five NRHP-listed properties, avoidance plans to minimize or mitigate effects of the Project will be developed in consultation with VDHR and FERC. For six resources, the Project is located at distances that are not anticipated to result in effects.

County	Historic District	NRHP Status	Relationship to Project	Distance from Construction Work Area	Measures to Avoid, Minimize, or Mitigate Effects
Giles	Newport Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Crossed by Project	Nearest Milepost - 211.7	Avoidance Plan to be Developed in Consultation with VDHR
Giles	Greater Newport Rural Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Crossed by Project	Nearest Milepost - 209.7	Avoidance Plan to be Developed in Consultation with VDHR
Giles	Prehistoric archaeological sites along the New River 44GS0038	Not Evaluated	Not in APE	Greater than 0.50 Mile	No Effect Anticipated
Craig	No Historic Districts	---	---	---	No Historic Property Affected
Montgomery	North Fork Valley Rural Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Crossed by Project	Nearest Milepost – 223.7	Avoidance Plan to be Developed in Consultation with VDHR
Montgomery	Lafayette Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Not Crossed by Project	2,210 Feet	No Effect Anticipated
Montgomery	Oak Hill Old German Baptist Brethren Community Rural Historic District	VDHR Determined not NRHP Eligible in 2003	---	0.95 Mile from Nearest Milepost – 265.7	No Historic Property Affected
Roanoke	Blue Ridge Parkway Historic District	VDHR Determined Eligible to NRHP	Crossed by Project	Nearest Milepost – 244.0	Avoidance Plan to be Developed in Consultation with VDHR
Franklin	Cahas Mountain Rural Historic District	VDHR Determined Eligible to NRHP	Not crossed by Project	9,300 Feet	No Effect Anticipated
Franklin	Boones Mill Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Not Crossed by Project	Greater than 0.5 Mile	No Effect Anticipated
Franklin	Penhook Historic District	Listed in NRHP	Not Crossed by Project	Greater than 0.5 Mile	No Effect Anticipated
Franklin	Bowman Farm	Listed in NRHP	Location unknown	934 Feet	No Effect Anticipated
Pittsylvania	Lynchburg & Danville Railroad Historic District	VDHR Determined not NRHP Eligible by VDHR in 2015	Defined District not Crossed by Project	Greater than 1 Mile	No Historic Property Affected

Stakeholders have specifically expressed concern about potential Project effects to two covered bridges, the Clover Hollow Bridge and the Sinking Creek/Link Farm Bridge. Each of these is listed in the NRHP. The Clover Hollow Bridge is located within approximately 2,000 feet of the nearest construction work area, while the Sinking Creek/Link Farm Bridge is located within approximately 380 feet of the nearest construction work area. Because of the distance from these features, the Project would result in minimal, if any, effects to the Clover Hollow Bridge and Sinking Creek/Link Farm Bridge. Concern was also raised about a Civil War cemetery in the Project area in Giles County. However, there is no record of a recorded Civil War cemetery in the area of the Project in Giles County. Both the Cahas Mountain Rural Historic District and the Bowman Farm were also noted as of concern by stakeholders. These resources are listed in the NRHP. The Cahas Mountain Rural Historic District is located approximately 1.76 miles from the nearest construction work area and the Bowman Farm is located approximately 934 feet from the nearest construction work area. The Project is not anticipated to affect these resources.

Historic architecture surveys are ongoing within the APE requested by VDHR during the April 21, 2015 meeting. MVP updated the APE and the maps on which it is displayed and resubmitted the draft plan to VDHR for final approval on April 30, 2015 (Appendix 4-H1). VDHR accepted the revised APE as indicated in its letter of May 20, 2015. MVP's architectural historian has been conducting a reconnaissance survey and has been recording architectural or historic resources style-dated as 45 years old (ca. 1970) or older within the indirect APE, and has been consulting with VDHR as to any need for more detailed recordation of selected resources. MVP submitted to VDHR Phase I reconnaissance architectural survey reports for the Mountain Valley Pipeline for Pittsylvania County on August 12, 2015 (New South Associates 2015b) and for Franklin County on October 8, 2015 (New South Associates 2015c). Appendix 4-H2 presents the results of the MVP architectural and historic resources survey in Pittsylvania County and Appendix 4-H3 presents the results of the MVP architectural and historic resources survey in Franklin County. These have been provided to VDHR by date of this report. Survey reports for the remaining counties in Virginia are in progress and will be submitted to VDHR for review and filed with the FERC in November and December 2015. Appendix 4-I presents the aboveground historic resources recorded within the Virginia indirect effects APE.

4.1.2.2 Construction and Operation Effects

MVP's goal is to avoid adverse effects to NRHP-listed and -eligible cultural resources. MVP is reviewing all previously and newly recorded archaeological sites that have the potential to be NRHP-eligible and will evaluate measures to avoid effects to these sites where appropriate. If necessary, Phase II and Phase III investigations (VDHR 2011) will be performed at NRHP-eligible sites that cannot be avoided by the Project. For NRHP-listed and/or -eligible sites that will be affected by the Project, MVP will develop and implement appropriate mitigations in consultation with the VDHR, FERC, interested tribes and other interested parties as required.

To the greatest extent possible, the Project will not result in direct effects to NRHP-eligible or -listed aboveground resources as a result of Project construction and operation. Where massive bedrock is not easily removed by conventional excavation methods, MVP may use blasting to break up rock. MVP will try to minimize the amount of blasting required to the extent practicable; however, blasting may be required in certain areas of shallow bedrock. Where consolidated rock is encountered during construction, MVP's preferred procedure will be to fracture and excavate the bedrock using standard construction equipment. MVP's blasting technique would typically involve small charges strong enough to crack rock in the pipeline

centerline. The impact of such blasting is expected to be limited to within 50 feet of the right-of-way. MVP's contractor will prepare a detailed Blasting Plan for each distinct blasting area, which will comply with all permit requirements. Structures within 150 feet, historic or not, will be evaluated for pre- and post-blasting condition. More detail of MVP's Blasting Plan and mitigation may be found in MVP Resource Report 6.

Indirect effects are possible in the form of potential partial views of the Project. MVP's siting of the Project has taken into consideration the potential for views from NRHP-listed and -eligible resources. As possible, MVP is attempting to minimize views that would be assessed as adverse effects to significant historic properties. If the Project would result in adverse effects to aboveground resources that are listed in or are eligible to the NRHP, then appropriate mitigation will be developed and implemented in consultation with the VDHR, FERC, interested tribes and other interested parties as required. Sites with potential to be NRHP-eligible that cannot be avoided by the Project will be tested and evaluated for NRHP eligibility following appropriate consultations.

4.2 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Section 106 of the NHPA, 1966, as amended, requires the FERC to take into account the effect of its undertakings (including authorizations under Sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act) on properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP, and to provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment. The Section 106 Process is coordinated at the state level in West Virginia by the WVDCH and by the VDHR in Virginia. The FERC, as the lead federal agency, must consult with the WVDCH and VDHR regarding the effects of the Project on historic properties. MVP, as a non-federal party, is assisting the FERC to fulfill its obligations under Section 106 and the ACHP's implementing regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800.

The FERC will use the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping and public comment process as their public involvement process under Section 106. Stakeholders have expressed a variety of concerns about cultural resources both through letters filed with FERC through the FERC e-library system and by directly expressing concerns to FERC and MVP staff at some of the open house meetings hosted by MVP.

Stakeholders have indicated concerns about the potential effects of the Project on the Appalachian National Scenic Trail and the Blue Ridge Parkway, both of which are listed in the NRHP. MVP appreciates the sensitivities of these locations and in consultation with the National Park Service (NPS), United States Forest Service (USFS), and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, has proposed crossings that would result in no or minimal modifications to the settings of these protected resources. See Resource Report 8 for additional discussion of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail and Blue Ridge Parkway, and Resource Report 10 for discussion of pipeline alternatives that include alternative crossing locations of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail and Blue Ridge Parkway.

Stakeholders have also commented that the areas through which the Project traverses contain a number of historic districts, including rural historic districts, and aboveground structures that are listed in the NRHP. They have also noted that there are cemeteries, many not mapped, related to Native Americans, enslaved African Americans, and Euroamericans (including possible Civil War-era burials) that may be in the path of the Project. In addition, they have expressed concern about potential effects to prehistoric period archaeological sites. MVP is conducting cultural resources investigations to identify these resources and is attempting to avoid effects to significant cultural resources to the greatest extent possible.

Nine organizations or individuals requested to be consulting parties for the Section 106 review process are identified in Table 4.2-1.

Table 4.2-1
Organizations and People Who Requested Consulting Party Status
County of Roanoke, Richard Caywood, Assistant County Administrator
Summers County Historic Landmark Commission, Steve Trail, President
Preservation Virginia, Sonja Ingram, Field Representative
Committee for Appalachian and Piedmont Preservation, Ann Rogers, Section 106 Coordinator
Pittsylvania Historical Society, Mark E. Joyner
The Association for the Study of Archaeological Properties, Mark E. Joyner
Preserve Montgomery County, Virginia, Dr. Anita Puckett
Roanoke Valley Preservation Foundation, D. David Parr, Jr., Trustee
Barbara Rasmussen, Ph.D., Historian

4.3 AGENCY CONSULTATIONS

Agency correspondence may be found in Appendix 4-J. Consultation correspondence with WVDCH is followed by correspondence with VDHR, and following that is correspondence with other agencies including USFS and NPS.

4.3.1 West Virginia Division of Culture and History

MVP initiated consultation with WVDCH in September 2014. Through telephone calls, letters, and e-mails, consultation about the Project has been ongoing. Tetra Tech transmitted the *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan* (Tetra Tech 2014a) (Appendix 4-K) to WVDCH by e-mail on November 6, 2014. In a letter response dated November 21, 2014, WVDCH concurred with MVP’s scope for the archaeological survey. Subsequently, on March 18, 2015, MVP submitted Amendment 1 (Appendix 4-L1) to the work plan that illustrated how LIDAR slope analysis information would be used to inform the field investigation (Tetra Tech 2015a). In a letter dated April 17, 2015, WVDCH concurred with Amendment 1. Amendment 2 (Appendix 4-L2) which elaborated on the definition of the indirect effects APE was submitted by MVP to WVDCH on April 28, 2015. WVDCH indicated approval in a letter dated May 8, 2015.

On February 19, 2015, MVP provided to WVDCH its *Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia* (Appendix 4-M). WVDCH concurred, generally, with the plan and provided minor comments (WVDCH letter of April 17, 2015). These suggestions were addressed and incorporated into MVP’s finalized plan (Tetra Tech 2015c).

Draft reports presenting the results of the cultural surveys were provided to WVDCH in a multi-volume series. Volume I was submitted to WVDCH in August 2015 and included results of surveys in counties that comprise the northern portion of MVP (Wetzel, Harrison, Doddridge, and Lewis Counties) (Appendix 4-N). Volume II included results of surveys in counties that encompass the central portion of MVP (Braxton and Webster Counties) (Appendix 4-O) and was submitted to WVDCH in October 2015.

WVDCH provided comments regarding MVP's Volume I report by letter dated October 6, 2015 (WVDCH letter of October 6, 2015). Two succeeding volumes of cultural resources reports that will cover the remaining West Virginia counties are in progress; it is anticipated that one report will be filed with the FERC in November 2015, and the remaining report will be filed in December 2015.

MVP developed Phase II work plans (WVDCH 2001) for potentially NRHP-eligible archaeological sites that cannot be avoided by the Project. Work plans for 15 archaeological Phase II evaluations have been provided to WVDCH for review to date. Seven of those work plans, which were submitted to WVDCH concurrent with the Volume I report, have been approved by WVDCH (WVDCH dated of October 6, 2015). MVP will file all reports and related WVDCH comments with the FERC when they are available.

4.3.2 Virginia Department of Historic Resources

MVP introduced the Project to VDHR with a letter dated October 13, 2014 that provided a Project description and introduced Tetra Tech as MVP's cultural resources contractor. On behalf of MVP, Tetra Tech and other MVP team members met with VDHR at their office in Richmond, Virginia on October 15, 2014. Topics discussed included a Project overview; the APE for direct effects and VDHR expectations for archaeological studies; the APE for indirect effects and a two-phased approach to historic architecture studies; ranges of cultural resources that may be located in the APEs; timing of surveys; and Project schedule. Phase I historic architecture studies will include site file and map searches with results presented to VDHR. Based on these results, VDHR would then define the Phase II scope (VDHR 2011).

VDHR responded to MVP on October 30, 2014 by letter. VDHR expressed the opinion that the Project has the potential to directly and indirectly affect historic properties and requested a formal scope of work. VDHR also recommended early consultation with the NPS and the USFS. MVP provided *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, Virginia Work Plan* by e-mail on November 12, 2014 (Tetra Tech 2014b) (Appendix 4-P). At VDHR's suggestion, MVP's architectural historian for Virginia spoke with the VDHR Western Regional Preservation Office (Record of Telephone Conversation, K. Person with M. Pulice, December 4, 2014) which confirmed that there are not currently any major historic resources (sites, communities, landscapes, etc.) known to his office that are not presently mapped in V-CRIS.

The Archaeological Site Sensitivity Model for counties in Virginia was submitted to VDHR on February 9, 2015. On January 8, 2015, MVP sent a digital version of the *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeological Sensitivity Model, Giles, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia* (Tetra Tech 2015d) (Appendix 4-Q). On February 9, 2015, the *Historic Architecture Background Research Letter Report* (New South Associates 2015a) (Appendix 4-R) was provided to VDHR. The Project's *Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia* (Appendix 4-M) was sent to VDHR on February 19, 2015.

By letter of March 2, 2015, VDHR concurred the Project's archaeological sensitivity model was generally consistent with VDHR's Survey Guidelines (VDHR 2011) and VDHR approved the work plan (Tetra Tech 2014b). VDHR requested that areas greater than 15 percent slope should be visually inspected to identify cultural surface features. In the same letter, VDHR provided some comments on the Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains and some modifications to the plan have been made in response (Tetra Tech 2015c).

Tetra Tech provided a draft indirect effects APE to VDHR on March 20, 2015 (Tetra Tech 2015e) (Appendix 4-S). MVP met with VDHR on April 21, 2015 to provide an update on the ongoing archaeological investigations (discussed in Section 4.1.2.1 Existing Resources) and to discuss the indirect effects APE. VDHR requested minor modifications to the indirect effects APE. In response, MVP updated the APE and the maps on which it is displayed and resubmitted the draft plan on April 30, 2015 (Appendix 4-H1). VDHR provided concurrence on May 20, 2015.

In a letter dated June 2, 2015 to FERC, VDHR stated the opinion that the undertaking has the potential to adversely affect historic properties and recommended that FERC make all necessary efforts to identify historic properties within a properly defined APE that may be directly or indirectly affected. Alternatives should be considered that would avoid or minimize effects to historic properties, and mitigate unavoidable adverse effects. On August 12, 2015, MVP submitted a Phase IA archaeological background study for Giles, Craig, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties (Appendix 4-D1). MVP also submitted the Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report for Pittsylvania County (Appendix 4-T) and the Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Pittsylvania County, Virginia (Appendix 4-H2). On September 11, 2015, MVP submitted a Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report for Pittsylvania County, Virginia to VDHR (Tetra Tech 2015g) (Appendix 4-T). On September 11, 2015, MVP submitted historic architecture survey files to VDHR comprised of printed forms generated from V-CRIS, site plans, and printed digital photographs labeled per the VDHR survey manual and contained within clear plastic sleeves to support VDHR's review of the Pittsylvania County historic architecture reconnaissance report. The photographs were the same as those contained within the Pittsylvania County historic architecture report. Also on September 11, 2015, MVP submitted a Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report for Franklin County, Virginia to VDHR (Tetra Tech 2015h) (Appendix 4-U). MVP submitted the Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Franklin County, Virginia (Appendix 4-H3), along with the printed V-CRIS forms, site plans, and labeled printed digital photographs in clear plastic sleeves to VDHR on October 8, 2015. When comments are received from VDHR, MVP will file them with the FERC.

Subsequent survey reports related to the remaining Virginia counties crossed by the Project and other areas where survey could not be performed due to previous denial of land access are in progress and are anticipated to be provided to VDHR in October, November, and December 2015. All reports and VDHR comments on those reports will be filed with FERC when they are available.

4.3.3 United States Forest Service

MVP's discussions with the USFS about the Project's crossing of the Jefferson National Forest began in October 2014 (Record of Telephone Conversation, B. Gunderman with J. Brown, October 15, 2014) (Appendix 4-J). In December 2014, the USFS indicated that USFS will use their own archaeology staff to perform archaeological surveys in the Jefferson National Forest and that USFS will write its own report and provide that report to the VDHR (E-mail chain, S. Marshall with M. Madden, December 11 – 16, 2014). The USFS survey of areas where the Project is proposed to cross their land is ongoing. MVP will continue consultation with the USFS and will provide additional updates to FERC as information from USFS becomes available to MVP.

The Project is proposed to cross the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST) within the Jefferson National Forest. While the NPS is the lead federal agency for the entire ANST, the USFS-Jefferson National Forest is the federal land-managing agency partner for the federal lands specifically protected for the ANST.

Archaeological survey in the area of the ANST will be conducted as part of the USFS archaeological survey. Additional discussion of the ANST may be found within MVP Resource Report 8.

A concern brought to the attention of FERC and MVP is possible impact on the cultural attachment local people have to their land in areas of the Jefferson National Forest. USFS defines cultural attachment as the cumulative effect over time 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). MVP has added two professional cultural anthropologists onto its team to address the issue of cultural attachment along the proposed pipeline route crossing the Jefferson National Forest. Results of studies performed to address this issue are anticipated to be available in early 2016. These will be filed with the FERC when completed.

4.3.4 National Park Service

MVP provided an Application for Permit for Archeological Investigations to the NPS (Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 Permit referred to as an ARPA Permit) on March 20, 2015. The focus of the application was on the area where the Project crosses the Blue Ridge Parkway. MVP will continue consultation with the NPS and will provide updates to FERC as additional information becomes available. Following issuance of an ARPA permit to MVP, archaeological survey within areas of the Blue Ridge Parkway crossed by the Project will be performed. Results of the survey will be included in a report that will be provided to NPS and VDHR for review. The report and subsequent comments will be filed with FERC when available.

4.3.5 Curatorial Facilities

MVP will return artifacts to landowners upon request. For artifacts not requested by landowners, MVP has arranged for permanent curation at two facilities, one in West Virginia and one in Virginia.

In a letter dated February 12, 2015, MVP contacted the West Virginia Collections Management Facility at Grave Creek Mount Archaeological Complex to inquire about its interest in serving as the curatorial facility for MVP Project artifacts collected as a result of archaeological surveys in West Virginia. The facility responded in an e-mail on February 18, 2015 that it would accept artifacts recovered by the surveys in West Virginia.

The Virginia Museum of Natural History (VMNH) positively responded to MVP's telephone inquiry about the museum's interest in serving as the curatorial facility for artifacts collected as a result of archaeological investigations for the Project in Virginia. In a letter of February 6, 2015, the VMNH provided the museum's collections standards to MVP.

4.4 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

In October 2014, MVP consulted the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to confirm that its list of Native American contacts included all tribes that may have an interest in the Project. No response was received from BIA. On December 2, 2014, MVP sent a letter to each of the tribes listed in Appendix 4-V, to provide information about the Project and to inquire about known cultural resources or ceremonial and sacred sites within the APE. Responses were received from four tribes: the Delaware Nation; the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma; the Stockbridge-Munsee Tribal Historic Preservation Office; and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma. On May 5, 2015, a second letter was sent to these tribes to provide a Project update and again ask about concerns. MVP also contacted 11 state-recognized Native American

tribes (Appendix 4-V) by sending letters to each of them on April 29, 2015. MVP has not received any responses from these 11 state-recognized Native American tribes. MVP will continue a dialogue about the Project with the tribes. MVP will file with FERC results of that continued discussion as additional information is received.

4.5 PLAN FOR UNANTICIPATED HISTORIC PROPERTIES AND HUMAN REMAINS

MVP has developed a *Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia* (Appendix 4-M). This plan was provided to WVDCH and VDHR on February 19, 2015 for their review and comment. The plan outlines the steps that MVP will take in the event that previously unknown archaeological resources or human remains are discovered during the course of project construction. The plan has been updated to reflect comments of WVDCH and VDHR (Appendix 4-J).

4.6 REFERENCES

- FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission). 2002. *Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation*. August.
- New South Associates. 2015a. *Historic Architecture Background Research Letter Report*. Letter report for Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ by New South Associates, Greensboro, NC.
- New South Associates. 2015b. *Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Pittsylvania County, Virginia*. Prepared for Tetra Tech, Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, by New South Associates, Greensboro, NC.
- New South Associates. 2015c. *Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Franklin County, Virginia*. Prepared for Tetra Tech, Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, by New South Associates, Greensboro, NC.
- Tetra Tech (Tetra Tech Inc.). 2014a. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2014b. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, Virginia Work Plan*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015a. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan, Amendment 1*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech 2015b. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan, Amendment 2*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015c. *Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015d. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeological Sensitivity Model, Giles, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.

- Tetra Tech. 2015e. Draft Area of Potential Effects for Indirect Effects. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015f. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report, Pittsylvania County, Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015g. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report, Franklin County, Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015h. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Survey, Volume I, Wetzel, Harrison, Doddridge, and Lewis Counties, West Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Tetra Tech. 2015i. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Survey, Volume II, Braxton and Webster Counties, West Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Tetra Tech. 2015j. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IA Archaeological Background Study, Giles, Craig, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin, and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- Tetra Tech. 2015k. *Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Cultural Resources Overview Report*. Prepared for MVP, LLC by Tetra Tech, Morris Plains, NJ.
- USFS (U.S. Forest Service). 1996. *Draft Environmental Impact Statement, APCo 765 kV Transmission Line, Volume IV Appendices*. Prepared by U.S. Forest Service, George Washington & Jefferson National Forests in cooperation with the National Park Service and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On file, USFS, George Washington and Jefferson National Forests, Valleypointe Parkway, Roanoke, VA.
- VDHR. 2011. *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia*. Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA.
- WVDCH. 2001. *Guidelines for Phase I, II, and III Archaeological Investigations and Technical Report Preparation*. Edited by Joanna Wilson. Prepared by the West Virginia State Historic Preservation Office, Charleston, WV.

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-A
Cultural Resources Overview Report**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-B1
Archaeological Sites Recorded within WVDCH Files**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-B2
Map Showing Archaeological and Historic Sites
Within 0.5 Mile of Project in West Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-B3 Archaeological Resources Located within the Direct Effects APE in West Virginia

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-C1

Summary of Aboveground Cultural Resources Recorded in WVDCH Site Files within 0.5 Mile of the Project in West Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-C2

Summary of Aboveground Cultural Resources Recorded within the Direct and Indirect Effects APE in West Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-D1
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Phase IA Archaeological Background Study
Giles, Craig, Montgomery, Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania
Counties, Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-D2
Archaeological Sites in V-CRIS Files
Located Within 0.5 Mile of Project in Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-E

**National Register of Historic Places & Virginia Department of
Historic Resources Data within 0.5 Mile of the MVP
Project [Privileged Information]**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-F
Archaeological Resources Located Within
Direct Effects APE in Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-G Aboveground Resources Recorded in V-CRIS Located Within 0.5 Mile of Project in Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-H1 Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Revised Indirect Effects APE in Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-H2 Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Pittsylvania County, Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-H3

Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, Franklin County, Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-I Summary of Aboveground Historic Cultural Resources Survey Findings and Recommendations in Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-J
Agency Correspondence**

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-K

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-L1
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic
Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan
Amendment 1

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-L2

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, West Virginia Work Plan Amendment 2

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-M Plan for Unanticipated Historic Properties and Human Remains, West Virginia and Virginia

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-N
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Cultural Resources Survey, Volume I,
Wetzel, Harrison, Doddridge, and Lewis Counties,
West Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-O
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Cultural Resources Survey, Volume II,
Braxton and Webster Counties, West Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-P Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Archaeology and Historic Architecture, Virginia Work Plan

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-Q
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Archaeological Sensitivity Model, Giles, Montgomery,
Roanoke, Franklin and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-R
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Historic Architecture Background Research Letter Report,
Virginia**

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-S
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Draft Indirect Effects APE, Virginia**

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-T
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report,
Pittsylvania, County, Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

**Appendix 4-U
Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,
Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report,
Franklin County, Virginia**

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-__-000

Resource Report 4

Appendix 4-V Contacts with Federally-Recognized and State-Recognized Tribes

CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION – DO NOT RELEASE