

Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-10-000

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Landowner or Land Manager Requested Route Variations or Related Concerns

FERC ID / Accession Number	Alternative	Parcel Number	MP	Summary of Issues	Mountain Valley's Response
20161024-5011	7a			Landowner is concerned about pipeline impacts.	No route variation was requested in the accession. In addition, Mountain Valley addressed VADCR's proposed Slussers Chapel variation in its response to Alternatives, Question 6, submitted February 17, 2017.
20161027-5132	7b	N/A	Multiple Locations	Landowner concerned about pipeline route through the Newport Historic District.	Mountain Valley evaluated in depth four alternatives to avoid the district: Alternatives 110, Hybrid Alternative 1A, Highway Collocation Alternative, and Northern Pipeline-ACP Collocation Alternative. None of these alternatives are environmentally preferable to the Proposed Route.
20161207-0011	7c	VA-FR-064.01	261.5	Landowner is concerned about pipeline impacts.	No route variation was requested in the accession.
20161212-5040	7d	VA-RO-060, VA-RO-061	245.1 - 245.5	Landowner is concerned with pipeline bisects their property.	The proposed route alignment throughout the subject parcels follows contours which are most conducive to pipeline construction. Mountain Valley has assessed a route that borders the subject property line and has concluded it is not feasible in comparison to the proposed route due to contour change requiring side-slope construction techniques, additional drainage feature crossings, and additional stream crossings.
20161212-5044	7e	VA-RO-060, VA-RO-061	245.1 - 245.5	Landowner is concerned with pipeline bisects their property.	The proposed route alignment throughout the subject parcels follows contours which are most conducive to pipeline construction. Mountain Valley has assessed a route that borders the subject property line and has concluded it is not feasible in comparison to the proposed route due to contour change requiring side-slope construction techniques, additional drainage feature crossings, and additional stream crossings.
20161212-5046	7f	N/A	Multiple Locations	Landowner is in support of the VADCR route of the pipeline on Brush Mountain to avoid Slusser Chapel Conservation Site	Mountain Valley addressed VADCR's proposed Slussers Chapel variation in its response to Alternatives, Question 6, submitted February 17, 2017.

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Landowner or Land Manager Requested Route Variations or Related Concerns

FERC ID / Accession Number	Alternative	Parcel Number	MP	Summary of Issues	Mountain Valley's Response
20161212-5234	7g	VA-FR-5498	266.2	Landowner has questioned whether Mountain Valley has looked at a different route near his property in Rocky Mount, VA.	Mountain Valley affected the subject landowner because of the Blackwater Reroute, which was incorporated into the Project in October 2016. Mountain Valley previously demonstrated that the prior route, which would have avoided the subject property, was not environmentally preferable to the Blackwater Reroute.
20161213-5021	7h		225.4	Landowner is in support of the VADCR route of the pipeline on Brush Mountain to avoid Slusser Chapel Conservation Site.	Mountain Valley addressed VADCR's proposed Slusser Chapel variation in its response to Alternatives, Question 6, submitted February 17, 2017.
20161213-0057	7i	VA-FR-117, VA-FR-119, VA-FR-5151	268.4 - 269.1	Property owner was concerned about location of the pipeline on her property.	Mountain Valley met with the landowner in late February 2017 and found an agreeable route on her property. Mountain Valley has surveyed the new proposed route and is in negotiations for the purchase of right of way.
20161216-5043	7j			Landowner is concerned with pipeline bisects their property.	Due to topography, the proposed pipeline route provides the safest and most constructible route.
20161220-0051	7k	WV-SU-041	170.7 - 171.2	Landowner is concerned about pipeline impacts.	Per landowner request, Mountain Valley incorporated a reroute into its October 2016 Proposed Route that avoided the area mentioned for a possible future housing development.
20161220-0010	7l	WV-BR-008	69.2 - 69.5	Landowner is concerned about pipeline location with regards to proximity of the Burnsville Wildlife Management Area property	No route variation was requested in the accession.
20161223-0033	7m	VA-FR-115	267.9 - 268.4	Trust requests that an access to ATWS and location of ATWS move to a more easterly location. In addition, the Trust asks to relocate the pipeline.	The proposed relocation would place the pipeline in a closer proximity to Sunshine Valley School.

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Landowner or Land Manager Requested Route Variations or Related Concerns

FERC ID / Accession Number	Alternative	Parcel Number	MP	Summary of Issues	Mountain Valley's Response
20161221-5574	7n	WV-BR-008	69.2 - 69.5	Landowner is concerned about pipeline location with regards to proximity of the Burnsville Wildlife Management Area property	No route variation was requested in the accession.
20161026-5020 / 20150420-5197	7o	N/A	171.4 - 171.5	Landowner commented on specific areas of concern pertaining to the Greenbrier River crossing, WV State Route 3/12 crossing and proximity to a few resources.	No route variation was requested in the accession.
20161110-5022	7p	VA-GI-049	206.7 - 207.3	Landowner concerned about pipeline route impacts to farm and associated businesses.	Mountain Valley has routed the pipeline through topography that is most conducive to pipeline construction. In addition, Mountain Valley has co-located with an existing utility corridor through the subject landowner which reduces the overall environmental footprint through the subject land parcels. If Mountain Valley were to reroute to the edge of the landowner(s) property, rather than its current proposed location, constructability concerns increase and additional impacts would result. Topography on the north and on the south end of the parcel would require side slope construction, additional tree clearing, and co-location will be lost.
20161222-5538	7q	VA-MO-005, VA-MO-084, VA-RO-033	233.5 - 234.3	Landowner concerned about pipeline route and permanent access road impacts to estate.	Mountain Valley has selected the best constructible route possible across this property. Landowners will have access to their property during and after construction. Mountain Valley has requested a permanent access road to maintain access to the ridge for right-of-way monitoring and maintenance, which is an essential function post construction.

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Landowner or Land Manager Requested Route Variations or Related Concerns

FERC ID / Accession Number	Alternative	Parcel Number	MP	Summary of Issues	Mountain Valley's Response
20161222-5006	7r	N/A	212.8 - 212.9	Landowner requests alternative routes that avoids the Greater Newport Rural Historic District.	Mountain Valley evaluated in depth four alternatives to avoid the district: Alternatives 110, Hybrid Alternative 1A, Highway Collocation Alternative, and Northern Pipeline-ACP Collocation Alternative. None of these alternatives are environmentally preferable to the Proposed Route.
20161228-0073	7s	WV-MO-012.210, WV-MO-012.220, WV-MO-012.225	188.2 - 189.2	Landowner concerned about pipeline impacts to water resources and soil erosion.	Mountain Valley has routed the pipeline in terrain and topography most conducive to pipeline construction. Impact to aquatic resources will be mitigated and all crossings will adhere to both state and federal guidelines.
20161222-5090	7t	N/A	Multiple Locations	Landowner has a preference for the pipeline route to transverse the Old Mill Conservation site. Commenter provided discussion of the concerns over hydraulic fracturing,	No route variation was requested in the accession. Landowner states a preference for a specific route.
20161221-5103	7u	N/A	Multiple Locations	the pipeline route near or through sensitive resources, and the adverse effects on forest resources.	No route variation was requested in the accession.
Glen Frith (Nov 2, 2016 public comment session)	7v	VA-FR-017.24	255.8	Landowner stated the proposed pipeline route divides up his property. Landowner is concerned about the proximity of pipeline alignment to residence. Landowner has concerns about the pipeline access road.	Mountain Valley has routed the pipeline in terrain and topography most conducive to pipeline construction. Mountain Valley's proposed route bisects the subject parcels at a location which is a center point between residences to the northwest and south of the pipeline. The distance from the commenter's home is over 1600 feet. Limiting factors that prevent an alternative route on the edges of the subject property include: residences, farm structures, and ponds. In addition, existing roadways utilized as access roads for the Project will be left in as good, or better condition once the project is complete.

Attachment DR5 Alternatives 7

Landowner or Land Manager Requested Route Variations or Related Concerns

FERC ID / Accession Number	Alternative	Parcel Number	MP	Summary of Issues	Mountain Valley's Response
James Chandler (Nov 2, 2016 public comment session)	7w	VA-RO-060, VA-RO-061	245.1 - 245.5	Landowner has concerns about the pipeline impacts to resources and property.	No route variation was requested.
Vicki Pierson (Nov 1, 2016 public comment session)	7x	WV-BR-008	69.2 - 69.5	Landowner requested a review of co-locating the pipeline in the same right of way as the 36-inch Stonewall Gathering Pipeline near her property.	The 36-inch Stonewall Gathering Pipeline is located approximately 0.7 mile to the east of the Landowner's Property from the proposed route. Due to the terrain in this area, it is not possible to collocate a 42-inch pipeline due to the narrow nature of the ridgeline that the 36-inch Stone Gathering Pipeline runs. Collocation would put the Mountain Valley Pipeline in side slope conditions that are not suitable for construction.
Ginger Smithers (emails to FERC staff dated February 21-23, 2017)	7y	VA-FR-117, VA-FR-119, VA-FR-5151	268.4 - 269.1	Landowner was concerned about location of the pipeline on her property.	Mountain Valley met with the landowner in late February 2017 and found an agreeable route on her property. Mountain Valley expects to adopt the route variation at a later date and is in negotiations for the purchase of right of way.
20170324-5140	7z	VA-RO-040, VA-RO-042, VA-RO-043	241.05 - 241.65	Landowner is concerned of environmental impacts and has stated a preference for an alternate route.	See Attachment DR5 Alternatives 6 (Accession No. 20160406-5119).