

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
Office of Energy Projects

- - - - - x  
Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC Docket No. PF15-3-000  
- - - - - x

MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE PROJECT

Robert C. Byrd Center  
992 North Fork Road  
Pine Grove, WV 26419  
Monday, May 11, 2015

The evening scoping meeting, pursuant to notice,  
convened at 7 p.m, before a Staff Panel:

PAUL FRIEDMAN, Environmental Project Manager,  
FERC  
ALEX DANKANICH, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation

With:  
LAVINIA DiSANTO, Cardno

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies and  
3 gentlemen, to our public scoping meeting to take  
4 environmental comments -- oh, in case you didn't notice, I  
5 don't have a microphone today. So I'll talk loudly, and if  
6 you can't hear me, please sit in the front row.

7 I'd like to welcome you to our public scoping  
8 meeting to take environmental comments on the proposed  
9 Mountain Valley Project or MVP, in West Virginia and  
10 Virginia in Docket No. PF15-3.

11 My name is Paul Friedman and I am the  
12 Environmental Project Manager for this project for the  
13 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which I abbreviate as  
14 FERC or 'Commission. We're all located in Washington, D.C.

15

16 Let the record show that this meeting began at  
17 approximately 7 p.m. on Monday, May 11th, 2015, in Pine  
18 Grove, West Virginia.

19 As you may have noticed, we have a court reporter  
20 transcribing this meeting. That is so we can have an  
21 accurate record of tonight's comments. The FERC has a  
22 transcription contract with Ace Federal Reporters, Inc., or  
23 'Ace.' If you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior  
24 to its placement in the FERC public files, you must make  
25 arrangements directly with Ace and pay their fees.

1                   The transcript will be posted on the FERC's  
2                   eLibrary system, which I'll describe later, within 15 days  
3                   after its receipt from Ace.

4                   [Slide presentation]

5                   The goal of my project team is to write an  
6                   environmental impact statement or EIS for the project. The  
7                   FERC team will consist of interdisciplinary specialists in  
8                   fields such as engineering, biology, geology and  
9                   archaeology. To expand our staff's capability, we use a  
10                  contractor, which in this case is Cardno.

11                  So let me introduce the other team members who  
12                  are here tonight. Over here is Olivia DiSantos; she is the  
13                  Project Manager for Cardno. In the back are two other  
14                  Cardno employees; Doug Monneyhan and Charles Brown. Just so  
15                  you all know, before Charles retired, he worked about 37  
16                  years at the FERC.

17                  Next to me is Alex Dankanich. He is from the  
18                  Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of  
19                  the U.S. Department of Transportation, or DOT. The DOT is a  
20                  cooperating agency that will assist the FERC in the  
21                  production of the EIS. Other cooperating agencies include  
22                  the U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,  
23                  the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the West Virginia  
24                  Department of Natural Resources and the West Virginia  
25                  Department of Environmental Protection.

1            Cooperating agencies have jurisdiction or special  
2 expertise They can adopt our EIS for their own regulatory  
3 purposes. So for example, the U.S. Forest Service will use  
4 our EIS to analyze potential amendments to their forest plan  
5 to allow the project to cross federal lands.

6            The FERC is the lead federal agency for both the  
7 authorization of this project under the Natural Gas Act for  
8 compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act or  
9 NEPA. To comply with NEPA, the FERC will produce an EIS,  
10 which I'll talk about more later.

11           The FERC was originally known as the Federal  
12 Power Commission when it was created by Congress in 1920.  
13 We were reorganized and renamed during the Carter  
14 Administration. The FERC is an independent regulatory  
15 agency. What that means is, a Commission decision cannot be  
16 changed by the Executive or Legislative Branches; however,  
17 FERC decisions can be challenged in court.

18           One of the industries we regulate is the  
19 interstate transportation of natural gas. We also regulate  
20 non-federal hydropower, electric rates and oil rates, but  
21 not the siting of either power lines or oil pipelines. So  
22 FERC has nothing to do with Keystone XL. What we do not  
23 regulate also is the exploration, production or gathering of  
24 natural gas, or the local distribution of natural gas.  
25 Those are all regulated by the States. Therefore, if people

1 are concerned about hydraulic fracturing or 'fracking,'  
2 which is a method of exploration and production, you need to  
3 file comments with your State agencies, not with the FERC.

4 Our agency is directed by five Commissioners who  
5 are appointed by the President of the United States and  
6 confirmed by Congress. And there they are up on the screen.  
7 It's always three people from the party in power and two  
8 from the opposing party. So Chairman Bay, Commissioner  
9 LeFleur and Commissioner Honorable are Democrats;  
10 Commissioner Moeller and Commissioner Clark are Republicans.  
11 And if there's a change in the administration, then that  
12 will flip.

13 The FERC staff, like me, are civil servants.  
14 Those five people are the decision makers. Staff do not  
15 make decisions. But Staff do make recommendations to the  
16 Commissioners, and our recommendations are made in our EIS,  
17 in the back, Chapter 5, so you can see what we're  
18 recommending to the Commissioners.

19 Tonight, I'd like to accomplish the following  
20 things: I'd like to summarize the project, I'd like to  
21 explain the role of the FERC in the review; I'd like to  
22 outline how the public may participate in the process, and  
23 I'd like to allow you, the public, an opportunity to voice  
24 your concerns about the project at this forum.

25 I ask that you reserve all questions or comments

1       until after our presentation here. There is a table in the  
2       back of the room manned by Charlie and Doug, and you can  
3       sign up to be a speaker there. We had some problems last  
4       week in Elliston, Virginia where people shouted out of turn  
5       and booed speakers they disagreed with. I find such  
6       behavior to be rude, but I know the fine people of Pine  
7       Grove will act in a courteous and considerate manner for all  
8       speakers regardless of the points of view.

9                I'd like to clarify that FERC and the cooperating  
10       agencies did not conceive of this project nor are we  
11       promoting it. The project was designed by Mountain Valley  
12       Pipeline, LLC, or Mountain Valley, a joint venture be EQT  
13       Corporation and NextEra Energy, Inc. We call them the  
14       'Company' or the 'Applicants.' The Company came up with the  
15       proposed location for their facilities, and it's up to FERC  
16       staff to analyze the environmental impact associated with  
17       construction and operation of those facilities.

18               The FERC is not an advocate for the Project.  
19       FERC staff are advocates for our environmental review  
20       process.

21               So, let's review some project background. On  
22       October 27, 2014, Mountain Valley filed its request to  
23       initiate the FERC's pre-filing environmental review process.  
24       We accepted that request on October 31st, assigned the  
25       project Docket No. PF15-3 -- you'll hear me repeat the

1 docket number often, because it's important when you file  
2 comments that you always put the docket number on it. And  
3 we selected Cardno as our third party contractor.

4           During pre-filing the company is supposed to  
5 communicate with stakeholders to identify issues and  
6 concerns, attempt to resolve those issues, and perfect its  
7 formal application to the FERC. Mountain Valley has stated  
8 that they would like to file its application with the FERC  
9 October of this year, 2015.

10           At the time of application, Mountain Valley must  
11 also file an environmental report that complies with the  
12 FERC regulations at Title 18 Code of Federal Regulations or  
13 CFR 380.12, and addresses such resources and topics as  
14 Geology and Soils, Water and Wetlands, Vegetation and  
15 Wildlife, Cultural Resources, Socioeconomics, Land Use, Air  
16 Quality, and Noise and Safety. During pre-filing, Mountain  
17 Valley will file drafts of those reports into the public  
18 record that anyone can comment on. I will explain later how  
19 to submit comments to the FERC.

20           In December of 2014, in January of 2015, Mountain  
21 Valley conducted sixteen open houses along the route of  
22 their pipeline in West Virginia and Virginia, with two  
23 additional open houses held in April for alternative routes.  
24 FERC Staff attended those open houses, and I see some of the  
25 audience did, as well.

1                   On December 1st, 2014, Mountain Valley filed its  
2                   first Draft Resource Report One, which is the project  
3                   description, and a summary of alternatives. The FERC Staff  
4                   issued a data request on those resource reports on March 13,  
5                   2015. Well, the resource reports that got filed and the  
6                   data requests are all available on eLibrary for anyone to  
7                   see, and everything I mention after here are also part of  
8                   the public record.

9                   On March 25, the FERC issued a project update to  
10                  inform the public where we were in the review process, and  
11                  that project update said that we would hold public scoping  
12                  meetings, and here we are.

13                  Mountain Valley filed revised Resource Report One  
14                  and First Draft Report Seven, which is Soils; and Resource  
15                  Report Eight, which is Land Use, on March 27. It filed  
16                  Resource Report Five, which is Socioeconomics; and Resource  
17                  Report Eleven, Safety, on April 10. A Revised Resource  
18                  Report Ten on April 14 and they filed a brand new Resource  
19                  Report Three, which is Vegetation and Wildlife; and a  
20                  Resource Report Four, which is Cultural Resources on April  
21                  24th. On April 17th, the FERC issued its Notice of Intent  
22                  to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, or NOI. The  
23                  NOI was sent to our Environmental mailing list; that  
24                  includes landowners, elected officials, government agencies,  
25                  Indian tribes; environmental groups, nongovernmental

1 organizations, local libraries and newspapers, and other  
2 interested parties. The NOI announced six public scoping  
3 meetings in the project area and explained how the public  
4 could file scoping comments. The NOI was also published in  
5 the Federal Register on April 28th, 2015.

6 The scoping period will end on June 18, 2015;  
7 however, the FERC will continue to consider comments up  
8 until the time we produce a draft EIS. We will use comments  
9 that we receive to shape the contents of the DEIS, which  
10 will focus on the issues raised during scoping. We will  
11 also consider the many comments we received after the  
12 beginning of pre-filing, on October 31st, up until the  
13 beginning of scoping on April 17th, 2015.

14 The FERC will not send out any answers to  
15 individual comment letters, but instead will address  
16 environmental issues raised during scoping under general  
17 topics in the DEIS.

18 Mountain Valley proposes to construct and operate  
19 a 294-mile long, 42-inch diameter pipeline in West Virginia  
20 and Virginia. The pipeline would originate at the existing  
21 Equitrans LP system in Wetzel County, West Virginia -- not  
22 very far from here -- and terminate at the existing  
23 Transcontinental Pipeline Company, LLC Zone 5 Compressor  
24 Station 165 in Pennsylvania County, Virginia.

25 Additional facilities would include four new

1 compressor stations in Wetzel, Braxton and Fayette Counties,  
2 West Virginia and Montgomery County, Virginia. The project  
3 is designed to transport about two billion cubic feet per  
4 day of natural gas from production sources in the  
5 Appalachian Basin to markets in the Mid-Atlantic and  
6 Southeastern United States.

7 There is a false rumor going around that natural  
8 gas from the project would be exported. This is not true.  
9 Mountain Valley has not applied to either the FERC or the  
10 U.S. Department of Energy for permission to export natural  
11 gas. Therefore, they cannot export natural gas.

12 Mountain Valley has stated that natural gas for  
13 this project is intended for domestic customers who generate  
14 electricity or use gas for local distribution.

15 Pipeline construction activities can be  
16 summarized as follows: Clearing and grading, trenching,  
17 pipe-stringing and welding, lowering-in, back-filling,  
18 cleanup and restoration.

19 This slide illustrates the prefiling  
20 environmental review process. I would like to inform you  
21 where we are in the process; we are in the scoping period.  
22 Later during the pre-filing process, the FERC will issue  
23 data requests to fill in gaps, and Mountain Valley would  
24 respond with revised resource reports.

25 During pre-filing, the public has the opportunity

1 to comment to the FERC about the project. The issuance of  
2 the FERC's NOI is our way of notifying stakeholders and  
3 requesting comments on environmental issues. We urge you to  
4 place your comments into the FERC's official record before  
5 the end of the scoping period. Later during this talk, I  
6 will explain how to submit comments.

7 Other opportunities for the public to comment on  
8 the project occur after Mountain Valley files its former  
9 application with the FERC. Post-application opportunities  
10 for comments include: You can comment in response to our  
11 Notice of Application and you can comment in response to the  
12 issuance of our DEIS.

13 Parties may request intervenor status in response  
14 to our Notice of Application. Being an intervenor is a  
15 legal position. Intervenors can request rehearing of a  
16 Commission decision. They also have the burden of serving  
17 all parties with their filings. You do not have to be an  
18 intervenor to have your environmental comments considered.  
19 You cannot intervene during the pre-filing process. You may  
20 only intervene after Mountain Valley Pipeline files its  
21 formal application, which I said before, they said they would  
22 do in October.

23 If you want to file comments into the  
24 Commission's official record, please follow the directions  
25 given in the public participation portion of the NOI. Do

1 not send emails to FERC staff. The Commission urges the  
2 electronic filling of comments through our Internet website.  
3 Just go to [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov), click on documents and filings,  
4 click on e-filings, and follow the directions.

5 If you have a problem with the website, you can  
6 always call our IT Department for help, and their phone  
7 number is listed in the NOI. You may also comment in  
8 writing by sending a letter the old-fashioned way, to the  
9 Secretary of the Commission at 888 First Street Northeast,  
10 Washington, D.C. 20426. Everything I'm saying right now is  
11 in the NOI, so that's why I go over it quickly. In all  
12 correspondence, whether electronic or in hard copy, please  
13 reference the docket number which is PF15-3.

14 You will also have the opportunity to comment  
15 orally at this public scoping meeting. We will be taking  
16 comments from attendees after my presentation.

17 Remember to sign into the speakers list. As I  
18 stated before, the transcript of this meeting will be placed  
19 into the public record. The FERC process is fairly  
20 transparent. You can see all documents filed in this docket  
21 through the Internet on our eLibrary page. If you want to  
22 be notified by e-mail of all future filings, you can use our  
23 eSubscription service. Both eLibrary and eSubscription are  
24 available through [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov), go to documents and filings,  
25 click on eLibrary or click on eSubscription to sign up.

1                   Again, all of that information is in the NOI.  
2                   Based on the application which may come in in October and  
3                   our own research, the FERC staff and cooperating agencies  
4                   will produce an EIS in accordance with the regulations of  
5                   the Council of Environmental Quality or CEQ, at Title 40,  
6                   CFR Parts 1500-1508 to satisfy the requirements of NEPA.  
7                   That document will offer our independent analysis of the  
8                   potential environmental impacts of the proposals and  
9                   alternatives. Generally, the EIS will discuss the current  
10                  environmental, identify potential project-related impacts to  
11                  specific resources, and present proposed measures to avoid,  
12                  reduce, or mitigate adverse effects.

13                  Once the FERC staff is convinced that the  
14                  application is complete so that we can fully understand the  
15                  potential impacts the project can have on the environment,  
16                  we will issue a Notice of Schedule for our EIS. In  
17                  accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005, other federal  
18                  agencies would have ninety days after the FERC releases a  
19                  Final EIS to issue their permits or approvals.

20                  The FERC staff will first produce a DEIS that  
21                  would be circulated for public comment. Copies of the DEIS  
22                  will be sent to our Environmental mailing list. After  
23                  mailing the DEIS, the FERC staff would come back out to the  
24                  project area to hold public meetings, take verbal comments  
25                  on the DEIS.

1 The comments again would be put into the public record, and  
2 we would address them in the FEIS.

3 The Commission would only make its decision after  
4 an FEIS has been issued.

5 There will be a section in the EIS that addresses  
6 pipeline safety. It is the DOT, not the FERC that sets  
7 standards for pipeline design, construction and operational  
8 safety. To explain the DOT regulations and pipeline safety,  
9 here's Alex.

10 MR. DANKANICH: Thank you.

11 Good evening, thanks for coming. My name is Alex  
12 Dankanich, I'm an engineer with the Eastern Region Office of  
13 Pipeline Safety, which is a branch of USDOT's Pipeline and  
14 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, commonly referred  
15 to as PHMSA.

16 PHMSA's jurisdiction begins once a project is  
17 approved. Then PHMSA works to ensure that the pipeline  
18 facilities are constructed, operated and maintained in  
19 compliance with the federal safety regulations.

20 If the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project receives  
21 permission from the FERC for this natural gas pipeline  
22 project, PHMSA's Office of Pipeline Safety will provide the  
23 regulations for the construction and the safe operation of  
24 the natural gas through the pipeline facilities, and will  
25 maintain regulatory oversight over the safety of the

1 pipeline facilities throughout its operation.

2 PHMSA's Office of Pipeline Safety will perform  
3 safety inspections on the natural gas pipeline facilities as  
4 well as on the plans, procedures, records to ensure that the  
5 design and construction are in compliance with Title 49,  
6 Code of Federal Regulations Part 192, which is the minimum  
7 federal safety standards for the transportation of natural  
8 gas by pipeline.

9 This oversight includes inspections to ensure  
10 such things as suitable materials are used in construction;  
11 so that welding is performed in accordance with the federal  
12 standards, and by qualified welders.

13 We ensure that the pipeline is installed to the  
14 required depth, that the pipeline is protected from  
15 corrosion, that the pipeline contains pressure-limiting  
16 devices, and that the pipeline is properly tested before  
17 use.

18 Beyond the construction process, PHMSA conducts  
19 periodic inspections of the operation and maintenance  
20 requirements that are again outlined in 49 CFR, the Code of  
21 Federal Regulations, Part 192.

22 The operator must ensure and must establish  
23 comprehensive written procedures that describe the types and  
24 frequency of the monitoring to ensure the continued safe  
25 operation of the pipeline.

1                   Safety is PHMSA's primary mission, and we  
2 understand how important this mission is to your community.  
3 If this project is approved, PHMSA will work to ensure that  
4 the pipeline facilities are designed, constructed, operated  
5 and maintained in compliance with the federal pipeline  
6 safety regulations.

7                   Thank you for this opportunity to provide the  
8 overview of PHMSA's pipeline safety program.

9                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Alex.

10                  The Commissioners will have the options of doing  
11 the following when reviewing Mountain Valley's proposal.  
12 They can accept it in whole or in part. They can approve  
13 the proposal with or without conditions, or they can deny  
14 the application altogether. The final decision by the  
15 Commissioners will be made in what's called an Order. The  
16 Order, not the EIS, would make a finding of public benefit.

17  
18                  If the Project is authorized, the Commission  
19 would make a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity  
20 to Mountain Valley. The Commissioners would base their  
21 decision on their Certificate Policy Statement that  
22 established the criteria for determining whether or not  
23 there is a need for a project. If the Commission decides to  
24 authorize the project, the FERC staff will make certain that  
25 the environmental conditions attached to the order are

1 satisfied. Those conditions usually include a stipulation  
2 that the Company has to obtain all other necessary federal  
3 permits and authorizations. For example, the Forest Service  
4 would have to issue a record of decision on a right-of-way  
5 grant, and on plan amendments before we would allow a shovel  
6 to be turned.

7 The Company must implement all of the measures  
8 that they committed to on their application and mitigation  
9 programs. FERC Staff and our contractors will monitor the  
10 project through construction and restoration and the  
11 completion of mitigation programs. We will perform on-site  
12 inspections for compliance with the environmental conditions  
13 of the order.

14 Now is the time for public comment. Let me  
15 emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the  
16 proposal. Other Commission staff will consider the economic  
17 need for this project and the rates to be charged for  
18 service.

19 As I said earlier, this meeting provides an  
20 opportunity for you, the public, to comment on the type of  
21 environmental issues you would like to see covered in detail  
22 in the EIS. The more specific your comments about potential  
23 environmental impacts, the more useful they will be for the  
24 Staff to focus our attention on important issues. Making a  
25 statement that you are for or against the project is not

1 particularly useful.

2           This is not a question and answer session; I am  
3 here to listen to you. We will address all of your  
4 questions and your comments raised during scoping, including  
5 these public meetings in our EIS after we have conducted the  
6 appropriate research.

7           There are some ground rules about decorum during  
8 this meeting. Please treat all other speakers with respect,  
9 whether you agree with them or not. No booing, cheering,  
10 applauding or yelling out of turn. If the audience becomes  
11 unruly and there is a public safety issue in my opinion, I  
12 reserve the right to close the meeting. We will take  
13 speakers up until everyone has spoken.

14           I will call up speakers individually, in the  
15 order in which they have signed up, by number. At other  
16 venues I limited speakers to three minutes because of the  
17 size of the audience. While the size of this audience is  
18 much smaller, we're going to stay uniform so that people who  
19 read transcripts will see that we treated all the venues the  
20 same.

21           So everyone will have three minutes to speak. If  
22 you have more detailed comments, please submit them in  
23 writing, either electronically or with a letter. We treat  
24 letters and electronic comments with equal weight with  
25 verbal comments.

1                   When you get up to the podium, there is no  
2 microphone, so you have to speak very loudly. State your  
3 name and spell it for the court reporter. If you represent  
4 an organization, tell us what that is without using an  
5 acronym.

6                   If you are a landowner along the pipeline route,  
7 please indicate where your property is, according to either  
8 milemarks or cross streets.

9                   As a matter of fairness, I will strictly enforce  
10 the three minute rule. Lavinia has a little child's toy  
11 stoplight; it's green for two minutes, it's -- or two and a  
12 half minutes; yellow for 30 seconds; and when the red light  
13 goes off, I will ask you to yield the floor.

14                   The first speaker tonight is number one.

15                   MR. BOYER: I'd rather face the audience.

16                   MR. FRIEDMAN: You may. Because we have no  
17 microphone, it's fine.

18                   MR. BOYER: I'm David Boyer, David, D-a-v-i-d,  
19 B-o-y-e-r. I live in Tyler County, I have oil and gas in  
20 probably about 11 counties, in the Northern part of West  
21 Virginia. I have an interest in over 100 Marcellus shale  
22 wells.

23                   I don't know of any of those, I know I haven't  
24 signed any leases with Equitable EQT or Equitrans or  
25 whatever hat they particularly want to wear that day, for a

1 number of reasons: One, this company is not paying for all  
2 the substances emitted from the well bore. They're  
3 presently paying in the area of a dollar-something to \$3.50  
4 a thousand for the gas they're purchasing.

5 Six years ago, I was getting between \$15 and \$17  
6 a thousand out of this county for gas of the same quality.

7 Why is this pipeline needed when gas prices are  
8 so low? We in West Virginia, whether it's been coal with  
9 the Hatfields having traded, having had Mr. Peabody trade a  
10 pig to Devil Ance for his coal, why are we still on this  
11 same type of endeavor in order to give our gas away at these  
12 prices?

13 EQT never has, as far as I know, has refused to  
14 now, doesn't look like they're going to change in the  
15 future, pay for all substances emitted from the well bore.  
16 particularly the distillates. They're one of the biggest  
17 opponents or proponents to force forward. Doesn't affect me  
18 a whole lot, but those of you that may only have a tract or  
19 two or three, from having a legitimate say. It's even worse  
20 than eminent domain. This legitimate say and properly  
21 negotiating your leasing rights that you would want to lease  
22 for.

23 I have multiple tracts which they do want. And  
24 I'm going to be very cautious about leasing it to them. I  
25 won't say I won't, because I don't want to be excluded and I

1 don't particularly want to have, just because if I have a  
2 very minor interest in a very small tract, of prohibiting  
3 somebody from having their income from that tract as well.

4 There's a big misuse of FERC to avoid proper  
5 negotiations. If they know they can force their way  
6 through, they'll force their way through.

7 I see that's my end. I have a lot more to say if  
8 anybody has any questions.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Sir, if you would please file  
10 detailed comments with the Commission, we'd greatly  
11 appreciate it.

12 MR. BOYER: Will do that; I plan to.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

14 Speaker No. 2.

15 MS. LONG: My name is Autumn Long, A-u-t-u-m-n  
16 L-o-n-g. I'm going to start with my concerns about the need  
17 to evaluate the several simultaneous pipeline proposals that  
18 are under consideration now as cumulative impacts. NEPA  
19 requires that FERC prepares a single regional EIS for  
20 closely related projects in the same geographic area, which  
21 I believe the simultaneous pipeline proposals fall under  
22 that category.

23 These impacts include increased greenhouse gas  
24 emissions associated with the entire sheen of production,  
25 transmission and consumption of gas, including that of the

1 local fracking, which leads to a lot of very heavy localized  
2 pollution.

3 I would like FERC to consider the climate change  
4 impacts that will be part of the simultaneous pipeline  
5 proposals; and also consider the fact that the true  
6 calculation of methane emissions from natural gas  
7 production, recent studies have shown that these emissions  
8 may be many times higher than the gas industry currently  
9 claims. So the greenhouse gas affects much larger than what  
10 is currently being calculated.

11 Also, these pipelines would result in the  
12 permanent loss of thousands upon thousands of acres of  
13 forest land, which means that carbon sinks, which currently  
14 store greenhouse gases, would be destroyed, thereby leading  
15 to a net loss of stored carbon and future storage capacity  
16 of carbon.

17 Also, impacts on federally-endangered species and  
18 species of concern due to the fragmentation of forest land,  
19 headwater streams, impacts on regional property values, the  
20 landowner's ability to use and enjoy their property,  
21 including the destruction of this region's rural character,  
22 limits on future use and enjoyment, including farming,  
23 timber; and I would like FERC to consider non-timber forest  
24 products as well, including game animals, medicinal plants,  
25 ginseng and golden seal being two of the most valuable;

1 various mushrooms, plants like ramps, that are important  
2 food sources and sources of medicine and income for people  
3 in Appalachia.

4 Issues of pesticide spraying and the danger of  
5 explosions which leads to fear, anxiety and potential buyers  
6 being dissuaded from purchasing property near these  
7 pipelines.

8 Environmental justice issues include negative  
9 impacts, so it will be disproportionately borne by low  
10 income rural populations, such as heavy localized  
11 environmental pollution due to the expansion of the pipeline  
12 infrastructure that will occur. And increased industrial --

13

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: You're going to wrap up right now,  
15 right?

16 MS. LONG: Okay.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you so much for your  
18 comments. Again, you have a lot more to say, which I think  
19 you do. Please give us detailed comments in writing, either  
20 electronically or in a letter.

21 Speaker Number three.

22 MR. ROSS: My name is Keith Ross, and the  
23 Mountain Valley Pipeline is projected to be on my property  
24 for a considerably portion. I'm concerned about the  
25 disruption of the topsoil on my ridge top and the effect on

1 my three watersheds. I have two water wells, and I'm  
2 concerned about my water quality.

3 I'm also concerned that this export pipeline, the  
4 Mountain Valley Pipeline, will give rise to a lot more  
5 drilling in my area, because the pipeline is going to be fed  
6 with gas coming out of my immediate area, which then will  
7 affect my water quality again because of the huge amounts of  
8 water used in drilling and the waste water that comes out of  
9 the ground.

10 I'm very concerned about water quality for the  
11 entire area, as well as how my watersheds are going to be  
12 affected by the pipeline itself on my ridge top.

13 Those are my major concerns as far as  
14 environmental things are concerned. I have a lot of forest  
15 land, mature timber, and if the pipeline were to rupture,  
16 having a safety valve every six miles, it takes a long time  
17 to burn up six miles of 1,000 psi 42-inch gas. And I'm  
18 concerned about my woods just being wiped out in one fell  
19 swoop if there was an accident. I know they put these  
20 pipelines in rural areas to have less impact upon  
21 populations, but I have to live in a rural area, and I feel  
22 like there's going to be a pretty big impact on me if  
23 something did rupture with the pipeline.

24 So I'm very concerned about the safety of the  
25 pipeline. And where humans are involved, I don't feel safe,

1       because we don't cross all our 't's and dot all our 'i's on  
2       a day-to-day basis. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

3               MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

4               Remember that when you make a comment, we will  
5       address it in the DEIS, under general resource topics.

6               Next speaker is number four.

7               MR. HARRINGTON: My name is Dan Harrington. D-a-  
8       n H-a-r-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. I live in Harrison County, directly  
9       adjacent to the proposed pipeline.

10              First thing I'd like to do is request that we  
11       have a 90-day extension on this comment period, because of  
12       the rural areas and the limited transportation options in  
13       this area. It's very hard for a lot of people to make these  
14       few and far between meetings. I think it's important that  
15       extra time be given because of that.

16              I, like the last speaker, am also very concerned  
17       with the water issues. Running pipelines on the tops of  
18       hillsides, you're going to be removing a lot of soil. Are  
19       they going to put it back correctly? Are they going to keep  
20       the topsoil separate? Are they going to put it on the top?  
21       Once they re-grass these things, you only have grass. Grass  
22       holds about two inches of soil. The trees did a lot more  
23       than that.

24              Pesticide spraying also will affect me. My water  
25       is a spring on a hillside. If there's pesticides being

1 sprayed in the area, if there's diesel spilled, it's going  
2 towards my water. There is no city water where I live.  
3 Everybody in my neighbor has either springs or wells.

4 The wildlife issue, as mentioned before, morels  
5 are a high dollar item. Ramps are a very important local  
6 food source. Herbal medicinals also very important. And  
7 also on the rural aspect of this pipeline, should there be  
8 an accident, a disaster, there is no infrastructure in place  
9 to deal with it. The local fire hall, all volunteers in  
10 this area, do not have the equipment and also will not have  
11 access to these pipeline areas. It rains a lot in West  
12 Virginia; it's unpredictable. There is no way to get to  
13 many of these pipeline areas, especially if it's winter or  
14 if it's muddy.

15 Will this pipeline be fenced? If so, you're  
16 putting a huge border across the whole state. You're  
17 cutting the animal migration routes in half if it is fenced.  
18 If it's not fenced, we already have a problem with people in  
19 the area four-wheeling on our property, on other people's  
20 property, and you're providing a free track for them, you're  
21 providing a road for people to drive up and down these  
22 mountains, causing erosion.

23 That's what I have to say tonight. Thank you.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

25 Speaker number five.

1                   MR. WATSON: My name is Randy Watson, R-a-n-d-y  
2                   W-a-t-s-o-n. I'm from Marion County and I'm not a landowner  
3                   on this job; I'm a partner in a consulting firm that does  
4                   work on particular jobs just like this; my company may or  
5                   may not be working on this particular job. I just want to  
6                   state that I'm in favor of it because of the jobs it would  
7                   create and the benefits to the local economy in the form of  
8                   domestic needs, and also the severance tax that it brings in  
9                   to the different counties affected.

10                   I do a lot of work in this county, and I can see  
11                   the benefits that the gas has brought to this county in  
12                   severance tax, such as your county commissioners have  
13                   provided electrical generators, diesel power generators for  
14                   different public service districts and being able to provide  
15                   water in the form of power outages.

16                   And I just wanted to state that I was in favor of  
17                   it, and thank you for your time.

18                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

19                   Speaker number six.

20                   MR. TESKA: Thank you for this opportunity.

21                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Please state your name and spell  
22                   it for the court reporter.

23                   MR. TESKA: My name is Ron Teska, R-o-n T-e-s-k-  
24                   a.

25                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

1                   MR. TESKA: And I'm here on behalf of my  
2                   grandchildren and those yet to be born. I'm here to speak  
3                   of environmental issues, especially water and EQT's concern  
4                   about that very same mineral, water. I'm here to say that  
5                   if folks want to look up my endless battle with EQT on the  
6                   Internet, you'll read about our situation with EQT and their  
7                   unreliability, not reliability. And their concern to plug a  
8                   gas well that they have no interest in outside of the fact  
9                   that they had to relinquish their lease because they were  
10                  not producing.

11                  They violated terms of the gas lease, they  
12                  violated state regulations, they violated DEP regulations,  
13                  and they've coerced the courts to side with them. We are  
14                  still dealing with them. They want to plug our gas well,  
15                  which they should have surrendered because they had not  
16                  produced for years, claiming that giving us our \$200 a year  
17                  was holding the lease, which is not true; that's not a  
18                  tenancy at will, that's a tenancy at their will. We had no  
19                  idea they were doing that, and that's the law, yet the court  
20                  side with them. That's the problem we're dealing with.

21                  The big picture is these energy corporations, the  
22                  governments and the courts are all working together to  
23                  ensure that this project will go through. And it will go  
24                  through. Benito Mussolini had a term for that relationship,  
25                  and I'm sure we all know what that is.

1 I think that's it. Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

3 Speaker number seven.

4 Speaker number seven?

5 State your name and spell it for the court  
6 reporter, please.

7 MR. HUGHES: Name is William, last name is  
8 spelled  
9 H-u-g-h-e-s, William Hughes.

10 Sorry for being late; if there were introductory  
11 comments by you folks, I missed them.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Guess what, I'm going to put them  
13 on the Internet so you can read them.

14 MR. HUGHES: Pardon?

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm going to put the comments on  
16 the Internet, my presentation will be on the Internet, and  
17 if you have access to a computer, you can read it on line.

18 MR. HUGHES: I just found out that this was going  
19 to be here tonight, so I'm very much unprepared. One of my  
20 concerns is that Wetzel County has had a lot of pipelines  
21 already. I use the phrase, "It's been pretty well sliced  
22 and diced, and I'm afraid there's no end in sight." I would  
23 like to see any additional pipelines use existing rights-of-  
24 way.

25 With that slips on pipelines because of poor

1 design or poor construction or both, there seems to be  
2 minimal oversight once FERC approval is granted, so that the  
3 terrain here, and our hills are moderately high, we do not  
4 have significant hills; I was under the impression that some  
5 of these proposed pipelines are heading south and each to  
6 much higher terrain, where we've not put such large diameter  
7 pipelines in before.

8           So the approval process needs to take into  
9 consideration how well it's going to be constructed, and  
10 whether or not there's going to be adequate oversight. If  
11 it was an 8 or 10 or 12 inch pipeline, I think we could  
12 possibly bungle through it, and it wouldn't do significant  
13 damage. With the 30 to 42-inch lines -- are going to  
14 present much more of a challenge.

15           The other issue I have with a lot of these  
16 pipelines, especially if they are eventually going to have  
17 FERC approval is not been given by anyone that I've asked,  
18 why a pipeline which is going to receive natural gas,  
19 pipeline-ready gas from various producers here and sell it  
20 to other private entities someplace else, why it is ever  
21 given eminent domain. My neighbors have some questions that  
22 I just told him I have not been able to answer; why would a  
23 pipeline taking a private product through a private pipeline  
24 to sell to a private consumer that is not having any  
25 residential consumers, why is it given eminent domain?

1           I just think there needs to be a way where people  
2           can be granted -- pipelines can be given permission to do  
3           it, but only if the landowner agrees to allowing it. Is  
4           that the limit?

5           MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

6           If you have more detailed comments, you can  
7           submit them in writing, We have procedures in our NOI for  
8           how to submit comments. You get those from Charlie and  
9           Doug. We also have a handout explaining how private  
10          companies were given eminent domain, and that was by an act  
11          of Congress in 1947.

12          MR. HUGHES: Thank you for being here.

13          MR. FRIEDMAN: You're welcome.

14          MR. HUGHES: Too bad I was unable to get here  
15          sooner. Thank you.

16          MR. FRIEDMAN: You're welcome.

17          All right. That's the last speaker we have  
18          signed up. So on behalf of the FERC, I want to thank you  
19          all for coming here tonight to help us focus the  
20          environmental review process on those issues of concern to  
21          you. I'd like to say I think that you were all extremely  
22          courteous and kind to all the speakers.

23          Let the record show that this meeting concluded  
24          at 7:46 p.m.

25          (Thereupon, at 7:46 p.m., the Pine Grove, West

1 Virginia public scoping meeting concluded.)  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Document Content(s)

Transcript-PineGrove-5-11-15.PDF.....1-32