



Mountain Valley Pipeline Project

Docket No. PF15-3

Alternatives Update

February 2015

ALTERNATIVES UPDATE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

On October 27, 2014 Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC (MVP), a joint venture between affiliates of EQT Corporation and NextEra Energy, Inc., submitted a request to initiate the Pre-Filing Process for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project (MVP Project). The MVP Project was accepted into the FERC Pre-Filing Process on October 31, 2014. On December 1, 2014 MVP filed a Summary of Alternatives with FERC describing its route selection process and major alternatives being evaluated. that described the route selection process that was utilized and identified major alternatives being evaluated. Since that time, MVP has met with agencies, landowners, and other interested parties, both through individual meetings and during 14 open house meetings held along the proposed route, and has continued to evaluate the proposed route and alternatives. . In addition, MVP has reviewed numerous comments submitted to FERC concerning the proposed route. As a result of this review, MVP has identified certain additional alternative pipeline routes designed to mitigate concerns that have been raised. Following is a summary of these additional alternatives. See the Project Overview Map for locations of the alternatives along the proposed route. MVP continues to evaluate these alternatives and will file with FERC in the future a draft Resource Report 10 – Alternatives that will include further descriptions of each alternative and a detailed comparison of the proposed route to each of the alternatives.

1.1.1 Alternative 110

Alternative 110 is 42.4 miles long located between about MPs 168.8 and 220.2 of the proposed route (Figure 1). The alternative includes a different crossing location of the Appalachian Trail and Jefferson National Forest, and avoids a number of resources and areas of concern identified along the proposed route in Giles and Montgomery Counties, Virginia. Alternative 110 crosses 5.9 miles of the Jefferson National Forest. Although the alternative is about 9.0 miles shorter (42.4 vs 51.5 miles), it crosses about 3.8 more miles of the Jefferson National Forest than the corresponding segment of the proposed route. Alternative 110 avoids the following concerns that have been identified as crossed by or in close proximity of the proposed route:

- Areas of karst geology in the Pembroke and Newport, Virginia areas, including areas surrounding Little Stony Creek and Sinking Creek, several mapped caves (including Pig Hole Cave, Smoke Hole Cave, Tawney Cave, and Cascade Waterfalls), and groundwater supply concerns expressed by residents in this area;
- Newport Community Park and Baseball Field;
- Greater Newport Rural Historic District;
- North Fork Historic District;
- Residential areas;
- The Nature Conservancy's Blake Preserve;
- The Mercer Angler's Club;
- James Monroe High School in Monroe County, West Virginia and Eastern Elementary School in Giles County, Virginia;
- The area of concern for the Red Sulphur Public Service District and the water supply for Peterstown, West Virginia;
- Moves the route to the edge of the Pembroke Fault Zone;

- Big Stony Creek Road (Virginia Scenic Byway);
- Moves the route to the edge of a threatened and endangered species buffer area in Monroe County; and
- Peters Mountain Wilderness Area and Mountain Lake Wilderness Area.

MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through meetings with the Jefferson National Forest, National Park Service, and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.2 Alternative 110J

Alternative 110J is similar to Alternative 110 except at the crossings of Sinking Creek Mountain and Brush Mountain within the Jefferson National Forest (Figure 2). Alternative 110J is about 49.5 miles long and crosses about 5.3 miles of the Jefferson National Forest, which is about 1.9 miles shorter and cross about 3.2 more miles within the Jefferson National Forest than the corresponding segment of the proposed route. Alternative 110J avoids the same areas and concerns as described above for Alternative 110 but is routed further to the east around Brush Mountain East Wilderness Area. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through meetings with the Jefferson National Forest, National Park Service, and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.3 Alternative 110R

Alternative 110R is similar to Alternative 110 except for the crossing of Sinking Creek Mountain within the Jefferson National Forest (Figure 3). Alternative 110R is about 44.9 miles long and crosses about 6.1 miles of the Jefferson National Forest, which is about 6.5 miles shorter and cross about 4.0 more miles within the Jefferson National Forest than the corresponding segment of the proposed route. Alternative 110R avoids the same areas and concerns described above for Alternative 110 but is routed through an existing power line corridor between Brush Mountain East and Brush Mountain West Wilderness Areas. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through meetings with the Jefferson National Forest, National Park Service, and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.4 Alternative 93

Alternative 93 is 4.2 miles long and located between about MPs 206.9 and 210.2 of the proposed route (Figure 4). MVP identified this alternative as a possible route to avoid pipeline construction near a number of residences in this area of Montgomery County, Virginia. The proposed route is adjacent to an existing overhead electric transmission line right-of-way through this area. Alternative 93 would turn northeast from the existing right-of-way and stay within the Jefferson National Forest, skirting around several road crossings and residences, before turning southeast to rejoin the Proposed Route and the existing power line right-of-way. The alternative is 0.9 mile longer than the corresponding segment of the proposed route and will increase disturbance through the Jefferson National Forest by about 2 miles. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through

meetings with the Jefferson National Forest. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.5 Alternative 87

Alternative 87 is 2.5 miles long and located between about MPs 207.4 and 209.4 of the proposed route (Figure 5). Similar to Alternative 93, MVP identified this alternative as a possible route to avoid pipeline construction near a number of residences in this area of Montgomery County, Virginia. The proposed route is adjacent to an existing overhead electric transmission line right-of-way through this area. Alternative 87 would turn south from the existing right-of-way to Coal Bank Hollow, skirting around several road crossings and residences, before turning east and north to rejoin the proposed route at the crossing of Mt. Tabor Road. The alternative is about 0.5 mile longer than the corresponding segment of the proposed route and would cross through the Coal Bank Ridge Conservation Easement. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through meetings with the Jefferson National Forest. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.6 Blake Preserve Alternative

The Blake Preserve Alternative is 0.8 mile long located between about MPs 211.4 and 212.1 of the proposed route (Figure 6). MVP identified this alternative as a route to avoid crossing the Blake Preserve property owned by The Nature Conservancy that is crossed by the proposed route. The proposed route is adjacent to an existing right-of-way through this area. The alternative would turn southeast from the proposed route to avoid crossing the Blake Preserve, and then would turn northeast rejoining the proposed route and existing right-of-way just west of Mill Creek Road. The alternative is about 0.1 mile longer than the corresponding segment of the proposed route and would be entirely new right-of-way. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.7 Alternative 135

Alternative 135 is 4.2 miles long located between about MPs 222.2 and 226.4 of the proposed route (Figure 7). MVP identified this alternative as a route that is located further from Spring Hollow Reservoir, which is the main source of water supply for customers of the Western Virginia Water Authority in Roanoke County, Virginia. The proposed route would be close to Spring Hollow Reservoir between about MPs 223.0 to 223.5. Concerns were raised during meetings with local officials, open house meetings, and in comments filed with the FERC about the pipeline's potential impact on the Spring Hollow Reservoir water supply. Alternative 135 would also move the pipeline further from Camp Roanoke, which is also a concern raised about the current pipeline location. At its closest point the proposed route is about 0.4 miles southwest of Camp Roanoke near MP 224, while alternative 135 is about 1.2 miles southwest of Camp Roanoke. The alternative is the same length as the corresponding segment of the proposed route however, the alternative will cross a Ducks Unlimited Conservation Easement. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted and through consultation with Ducks Unlimited. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.8 Alternative 210

Alternative 210 is 7.9 miles long located between about MPs 235.2 and 243.1 of the proposed route (Figure 8). MVP identified this alternative as a possible route that avoids Cahas Mountain and the Town of Boones Mill water source treatment plant, in Franklin County, Virginia. The proposed route would traverse the ridgeline of Cahas Mountain between about MPs 237 and 241, as well as a portion of the Cahas Mountain Rural Historic District between MPs 238.4 and 239.6. Concerns were raised during meetings with local officials, open house meetings, and in comments filed with the FERC about the visual impact of the pipeline along Cahas Mountain, and impacts of the pipeline crossing on the Rural Historic District. The alternative runs to the south of Cahas Mountain, avoiding construction along the ridge top and avoiding a crossing of the Rural Historic District. The alternative would also move the pipeline about 1.5 miles further southwest from the village of Boones Mill. The alternative is the same length as the corresponding segment of the proposed route. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.9 Alternative 144

Alternative 144 is 4.3 miles long and located between about MPs 275.0 and 279.5 of the proposed route (Figure 9). The alternative provides a different crossing location of Cherrystone Creek further from Cherrystone Lake, the drinking water supply for Chatham, Virginia. Officials and residents from Pittsylvania County, Virginia have expressed concern over potential water supply impacts from the proposed route's crossing of Cherrystone Creek. The alternative is 0.2 mile shorter than the corresponding segment of the proposed route. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.10 Alternative 192

Alternative 192 is 1.2 miles long and located between about MPs 277.7 and 278.9 of the proposed route (Figure 10). MVP identified this alternative as a possible method to reduce forest clearing in this area. However, this alternative does move the route closer to several residences. The alternative is the same length as the corresponding segment of the proposed route. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed Route will be provided at a later date.

1.1.11 Alternative 35

Alternative 35 is 3.9 miles long located at the southern end of the MVP Project between about MPs 283.0 and 286.2 of the proposed route (Figure 11). The alternative is about 0.7 miles longer but makes greater use of an existing transmission line right-of-way ending at Transco Station 165. MVP will continue to evaluate this alternative, on the ground as survey permission is granted. A subsequent draft Resource Report 10 with a detailed analysis and comparison of this alternative with the proposed route will be provided at a later date.