Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5

Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

General

1. Based on Mountain Valley's October 23, 2019 filing regarding changes made to the route alignment and workspace configurations, identify all landowners (name and address) who are now directly affected by the Southgate Project (pipeline route or workspace) who were not previously affected. Also, for the newly affected landowners, indicate if Mountain Valley has received landowner approval for the new alignment.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The Project filed its response to Environmental Information Request (EIR) 1 on November 7, 2019 (FERC Accession No. 20191107-5195).

Name of Respondent: Jim Sabol

Title: Project Manager

Phone Number: 412-395-3597

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Water Use and Quality

Water Resources

2. Verify the data in tables 2.3-4, 2.3-5, and Appendix 2A filed in the October 23, 2019 supplemental filing; and provide updated tables which have matching data; or provide justification for the differences in the data among the tables.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Tables 2.3-4 and 2.3-5 summarize the number of waterbodies listed in Appendix 2A <u>that cross the pipeline</u> <u>centerline</u>. There are a total of 223 waterbodies crossed by the centerline of the H-605 and H-650 pipelines, as presented in Tables 2.3-4, 2.3-5, and Appendix 2A. Waterbodies that are located within temporary workspace areas only, or crossed by access roads, are not included in the pipeline crossing tables 2.3-4 and 2.3-5.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Vegetation

3. As previously requested by the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and FERC in the October 3, 2019 EIR#4 item#15, provide a table showing the acreage of forested blocks affected by the pipeline and the amount of interior forest and forest edge affected in each block (include the milepost closest to each forested block). See the below table as an example of how the information should be provided.

Forest Block MP	Existing Interior Forest Block (acres)	Interior Forest Cleared for Construction (acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Cleared for Operation (acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Converted to Edge Habitat (acres)
2.0	85.05	3.66	1.27	19.38
5.2	2.69	1.34	0.34	2.69

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Table 3-1 below shows the acreage of forested blocks affected by the pipeline and the amount of interior forest and forest edge affected in each block is provided below.

Table 3-1 Forest Block Acreage Affected by the Project Pipeline Facilities					
H-605 Pipeline	0.1 - 0.2	121.31	1.89	0.61	8.51
Lambert Compressor Station & Interconnect / MLV 1 & H-650 Pipeline	0.0 RR & 0.2 - 0.5	56.25	0.00	0.00	2.82
H-650 Pipeline	1.4	91.49	0.00	0.00	0.44
	2.4 - 2.5	18.31	0.00	0.00	0.51
	4.7 - 4.9 & 5.2	78.10	0.00	0.00	0.98
	6.4 & 6.5 - 7.0	95.87	0.00	0.00	1.35
	10	4.95	0.35	0.00	2.28
	11.6 - 11.9	479.89	0.00	0.00	4.98
	12.8 - 12.9	10.34	0.00	0.00	0.95
	13.5 RR & 13.9 RR	30.29	0.00	0.00	0.70
	16.2	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.13

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Table 3-1 Forest Block Acreage Affected by the Project Pipeline Facilities Interior Forest Interior Forest Interior Forest **Existing** Permanently Forest Blockal Cleared for Permanently **Project Facility** Interior Forest Cleared for Construction ed Converted to Milepost Blockb/ (Acres) Operation^d Edge Habitate/ (Acres) . (Acres) H-650 Pipeline 17.8 RR - 17.9 RR 51.26 1.80 0.71 6.06 54.27 0.00 0.00 0.02 18.5 20.8 7.22 0.00 0.00 0.16 21.4 - 21.5 73.03 0.00 1.14 0.00 22.2 0.00 0.43 1.54 0.00 22.4 - 22.7 82.34 0.00 0.00 2.91 23.4 RR 201.98 0.08 0.00 6.02 23.9 15.09 0.00 0.00 0.92 23.9 RR 0.00 0.00 0.21 385.18 24.1 - 24.5 0.00 0.00 3.33 38.05 24.7 2.05 0.00 0.02 0.00 25.2 - 25.3 & 25.8 1.91 0.00 0.00 38.59 26.1 0.17 0.00 0.00 0.14 28.6 RR 29.71 0.00 0.00 0.07 28.9 & 29 17.87 0.00 0.00 0.84 0.11 1.74 29.4 RR 11.31 0.36 29.8 0.18 0.00 0.00 0.18 31.1 & 31.3 - 31.5 1.55 36.10 3.60 21.41 31.9 & 32.1 0.00 8.98 0.00 1.19 32.8 7.52 0.00 0.00 0.17 33.3 0.17 0.00 0.00 0.10 33.7 - 33.9 0.97 0.00 0.00 0.66 34.6 - 35.0 57.76 0.00 0.00 3.23 35.0 - 35.2 10.05 0.00 0.00 1.30 35.9 & 36.1 0.00 0.01 10.05 0.00 36.7 14.93 0.00 0.00 1.32 0.56 6.50 37.2 - 37.3 8.04 1.46 38.4 - 38.5 2.61 6.92 0.00 0.00 39.2 2.71 0.03 0.00 2.33 40.2 2.17 0.22 0.01 1.91 40.6 & 40.8 9.90 0.33 0.02 6.08 41.1 - 41.4 0.00 0.00 296.35 1.94

0.00

0.27

41.5

0.00

0.27

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Table 3-1 Forest Block Acreage Affected by the Project Pipeline Facilities

Project Facility	Forest Block ^{a/} Milepost	Existing Interior Forest Block ^{b/} (Acres)	Interior Forest Cleared for Construction ^{e/} (Acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Cleared for Operation ^d (Acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Converted to Edge Habitat ^{e/}
H-650 Pipeline	41.9	225.93	0.00	0.00	0.08
	42.3 & 43.0	50.29	0.12	0.00	3.84
	43.8	25.51	1.30	0.44	5.18
	45.4 & 45.9	24.56	0.00	0.00	0.23
	46.9 & 47.3 - 48.0	941.09	12.75	4.76	53.75
	49.6	20.99	0.00	0.00	0.50
	49.9 RR & 50.2 RR	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.07
	50.4 RR & 50.5 RR	18.21	0.00	0.00	0.90
	51.0 RR - 51.1 RR	31.39	0.00	0.00	0.69
	52.8	6.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
	54.5	2.84	0.00	0.00	0.70
	55.4 RR - 55.6 RR	123.38	3.04	1.46	16.76
	57.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	58.7 RR & 58.9 - 59.1 RR	11.82	2.71	1.02	7.58
	60.7	28.52	1.60	0.56	8.72
	61.2	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.21
	62.9	9.03	0.10	0.00	1.68
	63.3 RR - 63.4 RR	22.15	1.86	0.90	7.29
	63.7 - 64.0 RR & 64.5	210.63	6.61	2.00	25.95
	65.7	9.93	0.07	0.02	0.13
	66.3 RR	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03
	67.5 & 67.9	120.43	1.61	0.81	9.66
	68.3 - 68.4	32.91	1.33	0.49	4.85
	68.7	34.12	0.59	0.22	2.61
	68.9	3.63	0.00	0.00	0.62
	70.0 - 70.2 RR & 70.4 - 70.5	53.33	4.27	1.93	22.72
	70.7	2.78	0.61	0.17	2.42
	70.9	11.27	0.00	0.00	0.13
	71.8, 72.3, & 72.5	8.40	0.62	0.18	4.48
-	r Forest Totals ^{fl} delineated based on review	4,500.16	49.29	18.50	282.54

a/ Forest Blocks were delineated based on review of Project aerial imagery within the survey corridor and publicly available aerial imagery beyond the Project survey corridor. Forest Blocks include areas visible on aerial photography to consist of trees (including silviculture). Existing utility rights-of-way, roadways, fields, developments, and lawns define the limits of the Forest Blocks. The banks of the Dan River and Stony Creek Reservoir were also used to define the limit of Forest Blocks. Mileposts indicate the nearest Milepost(s) to the Forest Block.

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Table 3-1						
Forest Block Acreage Affected by the Project Pipeline Facilities						
Project Facility	Forest Block ^{a/} Milepost	Existing Interior Forest Block ^{b/} (Acres)	Interior Forest Cleared for Construction [©] (Acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Cleared for Operation ^d (Acres)	Interior Forest Permanently Converted to Edge Habitat ^{e/}	

- b/ Interior forest is defined as the area within a Forest Block greater than 300 feet from the Forest Block edge.
- c/ Construction acres include Interior Forest affected by construction for the pipeline facilities (i.e., temporary and additional temporary workspace and the area affected by operation of the Project (i.e., 50-foot pipeline permanent right-of-way). The 50-foot-wide permanent right-of-way between horizontal directional drill entry and exit points and railroad rights-of-way are not included in this acreage. Acreage includes a three-foot path between the HDD entry and exit workspace areas to allow for placement of the HDD guide wire. Delineated and approximated waterbodies within the Project survey corridor are not included in these acres.
- d/ Includes only Interior Forest within the operation footprint of the Project facilities, the 50-foot-wide permanent pipeline right-of-way in uplands, except in wetland areas where the operation width has been reduced to 10 feet in emergent wetlands, scrub shrub wetlands, and within 25 feet of waterbodies; and 30 feet in forested wetlands. The 50-foot-wide permanent right-of-way between horizontal directional drill entry and exit points and within railroad rights-of-way are not included in this acreage. Delineated and approximated waterbodies within the Project survey corridor are not included in these acres.
- e/ Includes Interior Forest located within 300-feet of the edge of the permanent right-of-way for the pipeline or operational above ground facility limit.
- f/ Sums may not equal the total of addends due to rounding.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Vegetation

4. Revise Table 3-3 in attachment 5-1 of Mountain Valley's responses to EIR #4 – (Locations of Remaining Biological Surveys Along the MVP Southgate Pipeline) to indicate what surveys are needed at each Parcel ID

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Table 3-3 identifies the locations of remaining biological wetland / waterbody surveys along the MVP Southgate Pipeline. Biological surveys for federally listed threatened and endangered species for the Project are complete, as summarized in the Projects response to FERC EIR #4 in Attachment 5-1 (FERC Accession No. 20191018-5168).

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species

- 5. Clarify the data presented in the *Habitat Assessments and Surveys for Rare Plants Along the MVP Southgate Project in Virginia* report. Include the following clarifications:
 - a. the respective number of acreages surveyed per field survey date range in 2018 and 2019;
 - b. the respective acreages of low, moderate, and high potential small whorled pogonia habitat that were identified in 2018 and 2019;
 - c. how the acreages assessed as potential habitat in 2018 (178.16 acres) and 2019 (104.28 acres) correspond to each other;
 - d. how the acreages surveyed in 2019 correspond to those surveyed in 2018 (The 2019 report suggests all acreage surveyed in 2019 consisted of new tracts required because of reroutes and tracts that were inaccessible in 2018;
 - e. clarify if there were any tracts surveyed in 2019 that corresponded to the tracts surveyed in 2018 during the incorrect time of year and indicate if any of these latter tracts are no longer part of the Project due to reroutes; and
 - f. clarify what portions of the 11.87 acres of potentially suitable habitat that will require survey in 2020 are comprised of small whorled pogonia habitat and smooth coneflower habitat, respectively.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

- a. No rare plant surveys were conducted in 2018. Target rare plant species surveys on behalf of the Project were performed in Virginia from June 7 to 14, 2019 and results are compiled in the "Habitat Assessments and Surveys for Rare Plants along the Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) Southgate Project in Virginia" report, submitted on October 16, 2019. Per Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VADCR) guidance, surveys were performed in Virginia for American bluehearts, downy phlox, and Piedmont Barbara's-button.
- b. No surveys were required for small whorled pogonia in Virginia, and no plant assessments occurred in Virginia during 2018.
- c. No plant assessments occurred in Virginia during 2018.
- d. No plant assessments occurred in Virginia during 2018.
- e. No plant assessments occurred in Virginia during 2018.
- f. No small-whorled pogonia or smooth coneflower habitat assessments were required in Virginia.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species

6. Provide any correspondence from the North Carolina agencies regarding Mountain Valley's survey results for Carolina Ladle crayfish and potential project impacts on crayfish in light of the survey results. Describe all mitigation measures Mountain Valley would use to minimize impacts on this species.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The Freshwater Mussel (Unionidae) and Carolina Ladle Crayfish Surveys Along the Proposed MVP Southgate Project in North Carolina report was submitted to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission on November 12, 2019, and contains survey results for the Carolina ladle crayfish. As a mitigation measure, the Project conducted species surveys for the state listed Carolina ladle crayfish. Additionally, the Project has committed to aquatic species removals prior to in-stream construction activity. The Freshwater Mussel and Carolina Ladle Crayfish report is provided in Attachment 6-1 and labeled "CUI/PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species

7. As indicated in the October 23, 2019 supplemental filing, Mountain Valley intends to use the Dan River, which is known habitat for federally listed endangered and threatened species, as the primary source for hydrostatic test water withdrawal. Pursuant to Mountain Valley's Procedures (VII.C.2), provide written permission from the appropriate federal permitting agencies granting approval of the use of the Dan River as a source for hydrostatic test water.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The Project has actively been working with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to receive permissions from the agency to withdraw water from the Dan River. As stated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Project will adhere to the stated conditions when withdrawing from surface water: withdrawing no more than 10 percent of the instantaneous flow rate, using intake screens no larger than 1 millimeter, and ensuring screen face intake velocities are not greater than 0.25 feet per second. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has not provided written concurrence of these mitigation measures to date.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

8. File comments of the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) of Virginia and North Carolina on Mountain Valley's definition of the area of potential effect (APE) given in section 4.10.2.1 of the FERC's draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) issued July 26, 2019.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

In comment letters dated May 21, 2018 and July 5, 2018 (Attachment 8-1), the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) approved the Project work plans (MVP Southgate Project: Proposed Procedures for Archaeological Survey, Site Testing, and Deep Testing Investigations in North Carolina and MVP Southgate Project: Proposed Procedures for Historic Structure Surveys in North Carolina) and include definitions of the Project's area of potential effect (APE).

Mountain Valley initially discussed the Project's APE with the Virginia SHPO at a meeting held on May 17, 2019. The Project work plans, which included the previously discussed APE, were subsequently submitted to the Virginia SHPO on June 4, 2019 (MVP Southgate Project: Proposed Procedures for Archaeological Survey, Site Testing, and Deep Testing Investigations in Virginia and MVP Southgate Project: Proposed Procedures for Historic Structure Surveys in Virginia). The Virginia SHPO did not respond to either that submittal or a follow-up request for comment from the Project on July 2, 2019. On September 14, 2019, however, the Virginia SHPO commented that the Pre-filing Draft of Resource Report 4 (which also included the APE definitions), accurately documented consultation to date (Attachment 8-1). In addition, the Virginia SHPO has reviewed the Phase 1 archaeological and historic architectural reports for the Project (review letter of February 13, 2019), which also included definitions of the APEs (Attachment 8-1). The Virginia SHPO acknowledged the APE for architectural properties in that review area but did not comment on the APE for archaeological sites in its response.

Due to the sensitive nature of the material included in Attachment 8-1 it is labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

9. Revise Addendum 1 of the Virginia archaeological survey report (Johnson September 2019) to provide mileposts for all recorded archaeological sites and isolated finds.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The revised Addendum 1 of the Virginia archaeological survey report (Johnson September 2019) containing milepost data is provided in Attachment 9-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

10. Provide the following data, updated to November 2019: total numbers of miles of pipeline route (and acres) inventoried for cultural resources; number of yards (acres), and number and miles (and acres) of access roads. Break this down by state.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

A table of Cultural Resources Survey Progress as of November 10, 2019 is provided in Attachment 10-1.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

11. Provide updated data in tabular format that includes cultural resources identified, location relevant to the direct APE, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) recommendations, SHPO NRHP determination, and Project effects.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Updated versions of Resource Report 4 Tables 4.5-7, 4.5-8, 4.5-9, and 4.5-10 containing information on all cultural resources identified is provided in Attachment 11-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

12. Provide the areas that have not yet been covered by cultural resources surveys as of November 2019, brokendown by state, for miles (and acres) of pipeline route, number of yards (acres), number of other workspaces outside the right-of-way (acres), miles of access roads (acres).

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

A table of Cultural Resources Survey Progress as of November 10, 2019 is provided in Attachment 10-1.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

13. File avoidance plans for Virginia historic architectural sites 71-4, 71-25, 71-36, 71-5212, 71-5217, 71-5222, 71-5227, 71-5598, 71-5727, 71-5732, and 71-5735, and file the comments of the SHPO on those plans.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Avoidance plans for Virginia historical architectural sites 071-0004, 071-0025, 071-0036, 071-5212, 071-5217, 71-5222, 071-5227, and 071-5598 will be completed as part of an effects report to be submitted to the Virginia SHPO in December 2019.

Avoidance plans for Virginia historical architectural sites 071-5727, 071-5732, and 071-5735 will be prepared if necessary following receipt of the Virginia SHPO's review letter for the Addendum architectural 1 report.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5

Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

 File SHPO review of avoidance and/or treatment plans for Virginia archaeological sites 44PY281, 44PY358, 44PY447, 44PY449, 44PY452, and 44PY454, and for Virginia historic architectural sites 71-5033, 71-5225 (44PY284), 71-5226, 71- 5621, 71-5622, 71-5623, 71-5525, and 71-5596.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

As of November 6, 2019, the Project has not received a Virginia SHPO review letter for avoidance plans for Virginia archaeological sites 44PY281, 44PY358, 44PY447, 44PY449, 44PY452, and 44PY454 or for Virginia historic architectural sites 71-5033, 71-5225 (44PY284), 71-5226, 71-5621, 71-5622, 71-5623, 71-5525, and 71-5596.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

15. File either an avoidance or treatment plan for site 31RK222 in North Carolina and the SHPO review of the plan.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

An avoidance plan for 31RK222 has been submitted to the North Carolina SHPO and is provided in Attachment 15-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

16. File the results of archaeological testing at site 44PY270 in Virginia, and testing results for archaeological sites 31RK44, 31RK97, and 31RK229 in North Carolina, and the SHPOs' review of the testing reports.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The Project has completed archaeological testing at site 44PY270, and a report on that work will be submitted to the Virginia SHPO and filed with FERC in November 2019.

Site 31RK44 will be avoided by the Project. An avoidance plan for that site has been submitted to the North Carolina SHPO and is provided in Attachment 16-1 and labeled "CUI/PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

The Project is presently conducting archaeological testing at site 31RK97, and a report on that work will be submitted to the North Carolina SHPO and filed with FERC once associated deep testing is completed.

The Project presently lacks landowner permission for archaeological testing at site 31RK229. Testing at that site will be completed once access can be obtained, and a report on that work will be submitted to the North Carolina SHPO once it is completed and filed with the FERC.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

17. File with FERC a copy of the revised historic architectural survey report for North Carolina that Mountain Valley provided to the SHPO on April 29, 2019, and a copy of the July 18, 2019 SHPO review of that report.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

The revised historic architectural survey report for North Carolina and the associated correspondence are provided in Attachment 17-1 as follows and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

- Transmittal Letter
- Report Text
- Report Appendices
- June 18, 2018 North Carolina SHPO comment letter
- July 1, 2019 North Carolina SHPO comment letter

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Cultural Resources

- 18. File copies of SHPO reviews of cultural resources reports and plans filed with FERC in October 2019, including:
 - Johnson, J. July 2019. Final Report, Addendum 1, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Guilford, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina;
 - Johnson, J. August 2019. Draft Report, Addendum 2, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Caswell, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina;
 - Johnson, J. September 2019. Draft Report, Addendum 1, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia;
 - Johnson, J. October 2019. Draft Report, Addendum 1, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Caswell, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina;
 - Karpynec, T., et al. July 2019. Revised Draft Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia;
 - Karpynec, T. September 2019. Draft Addendum Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia;
 - Karpynec, T., et al. September 2019. Final Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham and Alamance Counties, North Carolina;
 - Karpynec, T. October 2019. Draft Addendum Report 2, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham, Alamance, Guilford, and Caswell Counties, North Carolina;
 - Karpynec, T. October 2019. Final Addendum Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham, Alamance, Guilford, and Caswell Counties, North Carolina;
 - Millis, T. October 2019. Draft Report, Phase II Archaeological Testing of Sites 31RK217, 31RK235, 31RK247, 31AM414, 31AM442, and 31AM447 for the MVP Southgate Project, Rockingham and Alamance Counties, North Carolina;
 - TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK216, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK228, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK230, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK237, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK239, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK261, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Treatment Plan for Archaeological Site 31RK259, Rockingham County, North Carolina, Draft Plan;
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31AM441, Alamance County, North Carolina, Draft Plan; and
- TRC. October 2019. Protection Plan for Archaeological Site 31AM443 (Deep Creek Primitive Baptist Church Cemetery), Alamance County, North Carolina, Draft Plan

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

- The North Carolina SHPO review letter for Final Report, Addendum 1, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Guilford, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina, dated July 30, 2019, is provided in Attachment 18-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".
- The North Carolina SHPO review letter for Draft Report, Addendum 2, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Caswell, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina, dated September 19, 2019, is provided in Attachment 18-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".
- The Virginia SHPO review letter for Draft Report, Addendum 1, Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia, dated November 8, 2019, is provided in Attachment 18-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV DO NOT RELEASE".
- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a North Carolina SHPO review letter for Draft Report, Addendum 3 [mistyped above as Addendum 1], Phase I Archaeological Survey for the MVP Southgate Project, Alamance, Caswell, and Rockingham Counties, North Carolina.
- The Virginia SHPO review letter for Revised Draft Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Southgate Pipeline Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia, dated July 30, 2019, is provided in Attachment 18-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE".

- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a Virginia SHPO review letter for Draft Addendum Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Pittsylvania County, Virginia.
- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a North Carolina SHPO review letter for Final Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham and Alamance Counties, North Carolina.
- The North Carolina SHPO review letter for Draft Addendum Report 2, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham, Alamance, Guilford, and Caswell Counties, North Carolina, dated October 15, 2019, is provided in Attachment 18-1 and labeled "CUI//PRIV DO NOT RELEASE".
- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a North Carolina SHPO review letter for Final Addendum Report, Historic Architectural Survey for the MVP Southgate Pipeline Project, Rockingham, Alamance, Guilford, and Caswell Counties, North Carolina.
- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a North Carolina SHPO review letter for Draft Report, Phase II Archaeological Testing of Sites 31RK217, 31RK235, 31RK247, 31AM414, 31AM442, and 31AM447 for the MVP Southgate Project, Rockingham and Alamance Counties, North Carolina.
- As of November 11, 2019, the Project has not received a North Carolina SHPO review letter for the Protection Plans for sites 31RK216, 31RK228, 31RK230, 31RK237, 31RK239, 31RK261, 31AM441, 31AM443, or for the Treatment Plan for site 31RK259.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5 Dated November 6, 2019

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Geology

19. Verify that the data in table 6.2-2 and Appendix 6-B, filed in November 2018, did not require any updates due to reroutes and Project changes as submitted in the October 23, 2019 supplemental filing. Provide updated tables as necessary.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

Revised Table 6.2-2 and Appendix 6-B are included in Attachment 19-1.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller

Dated November 6, 2019

Post-Application Environmental Information Request #5

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Request:

Air Ouality and Noise

Air Quality

20. As requested in the October 3, 2019 EIR#4 item #43, provide any correspondence that has occurred since April 23, 2019 with the VADEQ regarding the Virginia air permit application and its completeness. In particular, we note correspondence referenced in the October 23, 2019 supplemental filing regarding a document by Paul Jenkins, an email from Matt Strickler, and a September 14, 2019 attachment that were not provided.

Response Submitted October 18, 2019:

Updated correspondence with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ), and all other stakeholders, will be supplied in the Project's Supplemental Filing to be filed October 2019. A revised criteria pollutant and formaldehyde dispersion modeling analysis will be submitted in early-November to the VADEQ.

Response Submitted November 13, 2019:

An updated correspondence log for communications with the VADEQ regarding air permitting discussions are provided in Attachment 20-1 and labeled "CUI//CEII – DO NOT RELEASE", including the document by Paul Jenkins. Secretary Matt Strickler did not have any follow up comments to the Project's June 26, 2019 email. Additionally, there was no correspondence with the VADEQ on September 14, 2019.

Name of Respondent: Mr. Alex Miller