

FRED CRAFT, CHAIRMAN
CRAIG CITY DISTRICT

CARL BAILEY, MEMBER
POTTS MOUNTAIN DISTRICT

KEITH DUNBAR, MEMBER
CRAIG CREEK DISTRICT



MARTHA MURPHY, VICE CHAIR
SIMMONSVILLE DISTRICT

JESSE SPENCE, MEMBER
NEW CASTLE DISTRICT

B CLAYTON "CLAY" GOODMAN III
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

COUNTY OF CRAIG
P.O. Box 308
New Castle, Virginia 24127
540-864-5010 Phone
540-864-5590 Fax

April 2, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Mountain Valley Pipeline LLC
Docket No. PF15-3-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Craig County Board of Supervisors (CCBoS) wishes to go on record opposing the Alternative Routes 110, 110J, and 110R proposed by Mountain Valley Pipeline to be run through Craig County. Furthermore, we are writing to register our extreme disapproval of the manner in which CCBoS and the citizens of our county have not been openly and honestly informed by MVP about almost all aspects of this project.

MVP has not been honest and forthcoming with critical information about the MVP project, and its potential impacts in Craig County. On October 27, 2014, MVP pre-filed information with the FERC regarding their plans for their 300-mile pipeline. At that time, project documents did not show a route through Craig County. Similarly in December 2014, MVP filed the document labeled "**Draft Resource Report #1 and Summary of Alternatives.**" In that document, MVP described an extensive process of evaluating alternative routes. Again, there was no mention of any routes through Craig County being under consideration or having been evaluated in any manner. On February 18, 2015, MVP filed the document "**Summary of Alternatives – February 2015 Update,**" which included Alternative Routes 110, 110J, and 110R through Craig County. Not only had the CCBoS and I not been informed of such routes, but our local newspaper had actually already published misleading information on route locations that MVP had provided to me and several CCBoS members in an informal meeting on February 9, 2015 (held only as a result of our request). Our county citizens only learned of the true locations of these Alternative Routes when a very general map was published in the newspaper on February 25, 2015.

We were finally briefed by MVP about the pipeline project at a CCBoS meeting on March 19, 2015. That briefing consisted of MVP describing the pipeline project in very general terms, and distributing an out-of-date project brochure to the CCBoS members. Most of our questions regarding specific details about the proposed routes in Craig County were answered vaguely, usually with statements that the routes were new and currently "under study." We did finally receive a commitment from MVP to hold a public open house for our citizens, which only last week was finally scheduled for April 7, 2015.

On March 13, 2015, MVP filed the document "**Draft Resource Report Nos. 1, 7 and 8.**" Despite the fact that we had not yet even been briefed by MVP by that date, and that the public open house still has not yet even been held, in that document MVP describes extensive public outreach that they have performed regarding the Proposed Route and the Alternative Routes (including 110, 110J, and 110R through Craig County). By this letter, I am informing you that our County government and our citizens have not been part of that extensive public outreach, and to date we still have very little information about MVPs planned actions regarding any possible pipeline construction in Craig County. County governments and citizens in other counties on the proposed MVP routes have been afforded many opportunities over many months to receive information regarding this pipeline, and to submit their comments about the project. This County and our citizens have not been afforded such opportunities.

We have not been treated in an open an honest manner by MVP, and our citizens have been disenfranchised from any meaningful input to date. Consideration of Alternative Routes 110, 110J, and 110R should not be on a parallel path with the other routes being considered at this time. Therefore, we respectfully request that Alternatives 110, 110J, and 110R be removed from consideration for this project. If the FERC cannot meet that request, we respectfully request that at least the issuance of an NOI for the project be delayed indefinitely, until Craig County government and our citizens have had the same chances for meaningful input that have been afforded to the citizens of other counties.

Sincerely,



B. Clayton Goodman, III
County Administrator

cc: Craig County Board of Supervisors
County Attorney
The Honorable Mark Warner
The Honorable Timothy Kaine
The Honorable Morgan Griffith
The Honorable Stephen D. Newman
The Honorable Gregory D. Habeeb