

August 4, 2017

Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Historic Resources
Attn: Mr. Roger Kirchen, Director
2810 Kensington Avenue
Richmond, VA 23221

**RE: Request for Update Meeting
Mountain Valley Pipeline
DHR File 2014-1194
FERC Docket CP16-10**

Dear Mr. Kirchen,

Thank you for the meeting on June 28, 2017 with Deputy Secretary Navarro and Mr. Holma to discuss continuing work on Mountain Valley's evaluation of historic resources along the proposed route. Additionally, Mountain Valley received your letter dated July 7, 2017 regarding our criteria of effects report. We are preparing a detailed technical response to your letter. In the meantime, I wanted to update you on our progress and also request a meeting with you to discuss next steps.

Based on feedback from you during the June 28, 2017 meeting and your comments in the July 7, 2017 letter, Mountain Valley has worked diligently over the last month to contact representatives of the five historic districts and other consulting parties with an interest in the Project to identify and discuss potential mitigation options. Here is a brief update on the status of this effort:

1. Big Stony Creek - Mountain Valley met with Historical Society Director Joseph Yost on July 28, 2017. We had a good discussion, but he felt it would be appropriate to obtain input from fellow Giles County Historical Society Board members to discuss further. A second meeting with the Board is now scheduled for August 15, 2017.
2. Greater Newport - David Brady, Section 106 Coordinator of the Greater Newport Rural Historic District Committee and Preserve Newport Historic Properties, indicated via email that after consulting with his steering committee, he believes it is premature to discuss mitigation measures and declined to meet with Mountain Valley. Mr. Brady's July 25, 2017 email is attached. An attorney representing the Committee subsequently contacted Mountain Valley and offered to participate in discussions. Notwithstanding the response from Mr. Brady, Mountain Valley will meet the Committee or its counsel if they are willing. A telephone conference call with the attorney is tentatively scheduled for early next week.

3. North Fork Valley - Gibson Worsham, the architect who prepared the historical nomination for this district, suggested Mountain Valley contact Elizabeth Hahn as the primary contact for the district in an email dated July 17, 2017. This email is attached. Ms. Hahn is a landowner active with the historic district; there is no formal hierarchy for the district that Mountain Valley could identify. Ms. Hahn indicated via email on July 26, 2017, that she had communicated with members of the historic district, and they declined to meet with Mountain Valley regarding mitigation. Anita Puckett from Preserve Montgomery confirmed this stance in an email dated August 1, 2017. This email is attached. No further direct contact is planned with representatives from North Fork Valley.
4. Coles-Terry and Bent Mountain - Ann Rogers, a member of Preserve Roanoke and Committee for Appalachian and Piedmont Preservation, indicated via email on July 27, 2017 that members of this historic district declined mitigation discussions with Mountain Valley. This email is attached. Further communications with representatives of this district are not planned at this time.

Mountain Valley also has contacted several other regional and statewide organizations that may have an interest in one or more of the above historic districts. The details of those ongoing outreach efforts will be provided in the forthcoming response to your July 7, 2017 letter.

In addition to our efforts with the historic districts, Mountain Valley would also like to request an update on the outstanding reports in queue at the VDHR. The table below summarizes these reports awaiting comment from VDHR:

Table 1 Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Cultural Resources Reports VDHR Comments Pending		
Counties	Report Title	Report to VDHR
Pittsylvania	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report, Addendum 2, and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation, Site 44PY0442, Pittsylvania County, Virginia	12/12/2016
All counties	Archaeology Testing Plans	7/18/2016
All counties, as applicable	Avoidance Plans	7/18/2016
Franklin	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase II Archaeological Survey Report, 18 Sites, Franklin County, Virginia	2/15/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, PDhase IB Archaeolgoical Survey Report Addendum I, Franklin County, Virginia (December 2016), Errata Sheets Regarding Site 44FR0393	5/10/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase I Archaeological Survey and Phase II Archaeological Evaluation, Site 44FR0370, Franklin County, Virginia	6/30/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Site 44FR0370 Avoidance Plan and Treatment Plan, Franklin County, Virginia	6/30/2017
Giles	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report Addendum I and Phase II Archaeological Evaluations, Sites 44GS0227, 44GS0229, 44GS0230, 44GS0231, and 44GS0236, Giles County, Virginia	1/24/2017
Roanoke	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase I Archaeological Survey Report of Tract VA-RO-054, Roanoke County, Virginia	7/5/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project,	

Table 1 Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Cultural Resources Reports VDHR Comments Pending		
Counties	Report Title	Report to VDHR
	Site 44RN0400 and 44RN0401 Treatment Plan, Roanoke County, Virginia	7/5/2017
Roanoke and Montgomery	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report Addendum I, Roanoke and Montgomery Counties, Virginia	1/16/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase I Archaeological Survey Report of Tract VA-RO-054, Roanoke County, Virginia	7/5/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase I Supplemental Information and Criteria of Effects Report: Addendum 2, Montgomery and Roanoke Counties	7/5/2017
Craig, Franklin, Giles, Montgomery and Pittsylvania	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Avoidance Plans for 19 Archaeological Sites and 2 Rock Overhangs, Craig, Franklin, Giles, Montgomery, and Pittsylvania Counties, Virginia (February 2017)	2/17/2017
	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, Phase IB Combined County Archaeological Survey Report, Addendum I, Giles, Montgomery, Roanoke and Franklin Counties, Virginia and Phase II Evaluation Site 44FR0412, Franklin County, Virginia	6/27/2017
Pittsylvania, Franklin, Roanoke, Montgomery, Craig and Giles	Mountain Valley Pipeline Project, REVISED: Addendum to the Phase I Reconnaissance Architectural Survey for the Mountain Valley Pipeline : Summary Report, Pittsylvania, Franklin, Roanoke, Montgomery, Craig, and Giles Counties, Virginia	7/5/2017

We would like to request another meeting with you and your staff to continue these discussions. Would you be available on August 10th for a call or an in person meeting?

Thank you for your consideration,



John J. Centofanti
 Corporate Director, Environmental Affairs
 Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
 625 Liberty Avenue, Suite 1700
 Pittsburgh, PA 15222
 412-395-3305 (office)
 412-417-3729 (cell)

From: David Brady
To: [Neylon, Megan](#)
Cc: [roger kirchen](#); [emerritt](#); [jeddins](#); [Ann M Rogers](#); [Ricky McCoy, VT](#); [John Ross](#); [MWFellerhoff](#); [Deplazes](#); [Clarence Givens](#); [msw1mdw3](#); [Justin Sarafin](#)
Subject: Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline
Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 3:38:06 PM

Ms. Neylon,

Thanks for the email response and the SHPO's July 7, 2017 document. After consulting with the steering committee, we think it is premature to schedule a meeting to discuss mitigation of historic properties with you. As it relates to the Greater Newport Rural Historic District, the May 11, 2017 MVP report to which the SHPO has responded is so riddled with mislocated and misrepresented historic resources, as to render discussion of mitigation useless until the errors are corrected and adverse effects on these historic resources are correctly assessed. For example, we find it difficult to understand how we can meaningfully discuss mitigation of adverse effects to the historic Adlie Jones Farm (VDHR# 035-0412-0010), a contributing historic resource to the District directly affected by the pipeline project, when, after two and a half years of study, your team of experts cannot even correctly locate the Adlie Jones Farm in the report. As it relates to the District, there are many other examples of mislocated properties, misrepresented effects, and missing information in the report.

Similarly, the alternatives evaluation process is far from complete, as the SHPO's finding of adverse effects on five historic districts in the proposed route is a significant adverse effect that has not been considered by FERC in either the Final EIS, when compared to other system alternatives that avoid these districts entirely. Additionally, there methodological errors and missing assessments of cultural resources that still need to be addressed in the Final EIS, as discussed in the reports of Tom King and Preserve Roanoke/Bent Mountain, among others.

Finally, it is the Committee's understanding that FERC is the one that needs to be doing the outreach on Section 106, not MVP.

For future correspondence, my last name is Brady, not Grady.

Regards,

David Brady
Section 106 Coordinator
Greater Newport Rural Historic District Committee and
Preserve Newport Historic Properties

From: "Neylon, Megan" <MNeylon@eqt.com>
To: "David A Brady" <Flyngcow@Pemt.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 6:55:43 AM
Subject: Mountain Valley Pipeline

Good morning Mr. Grady,

It was nice to speak with you yesterday. As discussed, I have attached the VDHR Criteria of Effects letter. This letter will be available on the docket no later than Monday July 24, 2017.

We are trying to reach out to a primary contact for the Greater Newport Rural Historic District to set a meeting to discuss potential impacts of the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project on the Greater Newport Rural Historic District and possible mitigation options should the project receive its FERC certificate.

We hope to set up a meeting with you and other interested parties the week of July 24th if at all possible. Please let us know if a day the week of the 24th is an option or if another day the following week is better for you. Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at this email address or at the phone number below.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to talking with you soon.

Megan E. Neylon
Supervisor - Permitting
Office: 724-873-3645
MNeylon@eqt.com

From: Gibson Worsham
To: [Neylon, Megan](mailto:Neylon.Megan)
Subject: Fwd: Mountain Valley Pipeline
Date: Monday, July 17, 2017 4:53:00 PM

Here you are-

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Betty Hahn** <foxonabridge@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 17, 2017 at 4:46 PM
Subject: Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline
To: Gibson Worsham <gibson.worsham@gmail.com>

Hi Gibson,

I am in Europe until July 24 but would definitely like to discuss the pipeline. Do you know when they wanted to talk. I can also come up with a list of people down the valley. It is rather late here now but in the morning I will try to put together a list. Thanks for asking. Just getting started on renovations. The old house is getting an exterior paint job while we are away.

Cheers,
Betty

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 17, 2017, at 3:39 PM, Gibson Worsham <gibson.worsham@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Betty-

This consultant for the Mountain Valley pipeline contacted me to give them names for people from the North Fork Rural Historic District who might like to attend a meeting to discuss the pipeline. If you have any names, would you please get in touch with her at the attached email address? Or if you don't mind, I can give her your email address.

I hope things are going well at the Plank Farm.

Thanks,

Gibson

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Neylon, Megan** <MNeylon@eqt.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 17, 2017 at 3:06 PM
Subject: Mountain Valley Pipeline
To: "gibson.worsham@gmail.com" <gibson.worsham@gmail.com>

Gibson,

Thank you again for taking the time to talk with me this afternoon, I have attached a map that shows the location in which Mountain Valley proposes to cross the North Fork Valley Rural Historic District.

Per our discussion, Mountain Valley is trying to reach out to a primary contact within the North Fork Rural Historic District to set a meeting to discuss impacts of the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project on the Historic District and potential mitigation options.

Any contact information that you could provide for Elizabeth Hahn and others within the District would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Megan E. Neylon

Supervisor - Permitting

Office: [724-873-3645](tel:724-873-3645)

555 Southpointe Boulevard

Suite 200

Canonsburg, PA 15317

MNeylon@eqt.com

<MVP_Rev5_1_27_Crossing_NorthFolk_HD.PDF>

From: Betty Hahn
To: [Evelyn Tidlow](mailto:Evelyn.Tidlow)
Cc: [Neylon, Megan](mailto:Neylon.Megan)
Subject: Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline - North Fork Rural Historic District Meeting
Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 2:19:30 PM

Hello Evelyn

I have heard back again from folks here about a possible meeting and contrary to what I said in my last email, people have changed their minds and no one wants to have a meeting. This is because no one believes the pipeline IS in fact something that can be mitigated at all, and as you are already working for the pipeline company, no one believes there is any point to such a meeting. I have to admit that I agree and have felt this way all along but just thought maybe some folks would like to meet to express this. As it turns out, no one does. This pipeline is completely egregious to our whole way of life around here. I am sorry but that is the way we are all feeling. So I am dropping any attempts to make any effort toward a meeting on your behalf.

Elizabeth Hahn

> On Jul 24, 2017, at 4:04 PM, Evelyn Tidlow <E.Tidlow@gaiconsultants.com> wrote:

>

> Ms Hahn -

>

> Hope you've had a wonderful trip and are having an easy trip home.

>

> Gibson suggested that we reach out to Kathleen Grubb as one of the folks who may be interested in attending a meeting regarding the district. I wanted to check in with you before we contact her to make sure that we aren't duplicating efforts. Please let me know if you think we should contact her or if this is someone you will be in contact with. Again, please don't hesitate to let me know if there's anything I can do to help with this effort.

>

> Thanks again for your assistance.

>

> Best,

> Evelyn

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Betty Hahn [<mailto:foxonabridge@gmail.com>]

> Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 1:11 PM

> To: Evelyn Tidlow <E.Tidlow@gaiconsultants.com>

> Subject: Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline - North Fork Rural Historic District Meeting

>

> Hello Ms. Tidlow

>

> I have received your email, but as I told Gibson Worsham, I am in Europe until very late on July 24. I do know people in the valley who I believe would be interested in talking to you. My problem is that I do not have all their contact information with me, which may make a meeting right after I return rather difficult. I will attempt to find ways to contact folks but am not sure at this point. I will email again soon regarding what I find out.

>

> Elizabeth Hahn

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>> On Jul 18, 2017, at 3:19 PM, Evelyn Tidlow <E.Tidlow@gaiconsultants.com> wrote:

>>

>> Ms. Hahn -

>>

>> I'm writing on behalf of Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) per your emails with Mr. Gibson Worsham yesterday.

I am a consultant to MVP assisting the project team with Section 106 compliance activities. We are trying to reach out to a primary contact for the North Fork Rural Historic District to set a meeting to discuss potential impacts of the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project on the North Fork Rural Historic District and possible mitigation options should the project receive its FERC certificate.

>>

>> We hope to set up a meeting with you and other interested parties the week of July 24th if at all possible. Please let us know if a day the week of the 24th is an option or if another day the following week is better for you. Please let me know if I can provide any help in arranging this meeting or if you have any questions. I can be reached at this email address or at the phone number below.

>>

>> Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to talking with you soon.

>>

>> Evelyn M. Tidlow

>> Assistant Director

>> GAI Consulting

>> 612-812-5478

>>

>>

From: Anita Puckett
To: [Neylon, Megan](mailto:MNeylon@eqt.com)
Subject: Re: North Fork Valley Rural Historic District
Date: Tuesday, August 01, 2017 5:16:45 PM

Sorry, Megan. Our stance is one that no mitigation is possible. MVP needs to move outside the entire District. There's no point in meeting.

Anita

On Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 11:16 AM, Neylon, Megan <MNeylon@eqt.com> wrote:

Anita,

Elizabeth (Betty) Hahn sent an email to Mountain Valley on July 26, 2017 stating that she has spoken to people interested in the North Fork Valley Rural Historic District and that they decline a meeting with Mountain Valley. Based on your email below, I wanted to reach out to you to see if you would still like to meet. If you would still be interested in meeting with Mountain Valley, I would like to set up a date and time. Please feel free to give me a call to discuss.

Thank you,

Megan E. Neylon

Supervisor - Permitting

Office: [724-873-3645](tel:724-873-3645)

MNeylon@eqt.com

From: Anita Puckett [mailto:anitampuckett@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 10:00 AM

To: Neylon, Megan <MNeylon@eqt.com>; Sheriff, David <fires1957@yahoo.com>; Ann M Rogers <amelvin3@verizon.net>

Subject: North Fork Valley Rural Historic District

Dear Ms. Neylon,

A short message to let you know that I'm a representative of Preserve Montgomery who is

working on developing a Section 106 based response to MVP's proposed crossing of the North Fork Valley Rural Historic District.

Mr. Brady and Ms. Rogers and I have been collaborating as well. Perhaps I can talk or meet with you in Pearisburg, should they find my attending to be relevant to their needs?

Sincerely,

Anita Puckett

Preserve Montgomery County, Virginia

From: Ann M Rogers
To: [Neylon, Megan](#)
Cc: [Kirchen Roger \(DHR\)](#); [Elizabeth Merritt](#); [John Eddins](#); [David Brady](#); [Andrea Ferster](#); [Bert Bondurant](#); [Bonnie Law](#); [Julie Gantenbein](#); [Richard Caywood](#); [Ruth Ellen Kuhnel](#)
Subject: Re: Mountain Valley Pipeline Meeting
Date: Thursday, July 27, 2017 4:15:10 PM

Megan,

I do apologize for taking so long to respond to your invitation to meet to discuss the Mountain Valley Pipeline's impacts to the Bent Mountain and Coles-Terry Rural Historic Districts.

I agree with and wholeheartedly endorse the Virginia SHPO's finding of adverse effects on five historic districts in the proposed route of the MVP. Please refer to the SHPO's letter to you dated 7-7-17.

However, after consultation with various stakeholders who have an interest in the Mountain Valley Pipeline's impacts to historic resources including the Bent Mountain, Coles-Terry, and Blue Ridge Parkway Historic Districts, and other MVP-affected historic resources, I have concluded that until MVP is able to correct the serious flaws in its May 10 cultural resources filing, as discussed in my filing to FERC sent in behalf of Preserve Roanoke on July 12, it is pointless to discuss mitigation.

MVP has not yet offered a reasonable assessment of impacts, which is a necessary precursor to discussion of mitigation.

Thank you for contacting me.

Ann Rogers
Preserve Roanoke

From: "Neylon, Megan" <MNeylon@eqt.com>
To: "Amelvin3@verizon.net" <Amelvin3@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:20 PM
Subject: Mountain Valley Pipeline Meeting

Hi Ann,

Per our conversation on Friday July 21, 2017, Mountain Valley Pipeline is trying to set a meeting with you and any other stakeholders interested in the Bent Mountain and Coles-Terry Historic Districts. Mountain Valley is considering adding the following people to the invite list. If there are any additional people that you think should attend, please let me know.

Ashley Webb – The Historical Society of Western Virginia
Alison Blanton – Roanoke Valley Preservation
Sonja Ingram – Preserve Virginia

We would like to have this meeting as soon as possible. We will be in the area on Thursday 7/27/17 as you know to

meet with Big Stony Historic District. If we could make it work, Mountain Valley could meet with you and others interested in Coles-Terry and Bent Mountain Historic Districts later in the afternoon on Thursday.

Thank you,

Megan E. Neylon
Supervisor - Permitting
Office: 724-873-3645
MNeylon@eqt.com