

BEFORE THE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
OF  
WEST VIRGINIA  
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING

\* \* \* \* \*

IN RE: MOUNTAINEER XPRESS PIPELINE

\* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE: JACOB GLANCE, Chair

HEARING: Tuesday, December 12, 2017  
6:09 p.m.

LOCATION: Ripley High School Library  
2 School Street  
Ripley, WV 25271

WITNESSES: Cynthia Ellis, Vivian Stockmen, Robin  
Blakeman, Mark Connelly, Eve Marcum-Atkinson  
Reporter: Caroline Swanson

Any reproduction of this transcript  
is prohibited without authorization  
by the certifying agency

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

I N D E X

OPENING REMARKS

By Chairman Glance 5

TESTIMONY

By Cynthia Ellis 5 - 12

TESTIMONY

By Vivian Stockmen 12 - 15

TESTIMONY

By Robin Blakeman 16 - 20

TESTIMONY

By Mark Connelly 21 - 23

TESTIMONY

By Eve Marcum-Atkinson 24 - 25

CLOSING REMARKS

By Chairman Glance 25 - 26

CERTIFICATE 27

E X H I B I T S

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

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Offered</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Admitted</u>
---------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------

NONE OFFERED

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-----

CHAIR JACOB GLANCE: Good evening,  
everybody. I'm Jake Glance from the Department of  
Environmental Protection's Public Information office.  
Welcome to tonight's public hearing on the construction  
stormwater permit for the Mountaineer Xpress pipeline.  
The permit number is WVR310872. Also here tonight are  
Mike Huff with the Public Information office, Dennis  
Stotlemeyer with the Environmental Advocate, and Rick  
Adams and John Michael Bosely of the Division of Water  
and Waste Management.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is to  
give you the opportunity to share your comments with the  
DEP about the Mountaineer Xpress pipeline's construction  
stormwater permit. Tonight's hearing is being recorded  
by a court reporter so that the comments shared can be  
part of the public rulemaking record. To ensure that we  
successfully achieve the purpose of this hearing, we ask  
that everyone be respectful and considerate of each other  
by refraining from interrupting others while they're  
speaking, and keeping your comments on topic so that our  
time schedule is used efficiently.

For those wishing to speak, when I call

1 you up to provide your comments, please state your name  
2 and say if you are representing any groups or  
3 organizations. If you have written comments that you  
4 would like to submit in addition to your spoken comments,  
5 please hand them to me after you speak or at the  
6 conclusion of the hearing.

7                   Please remember that this hearing is not  
8 the proper forum for questions and answers. We are here  
9 to receive comments on this permit and will respond to  
10 each comment when we issue a decision.

11                   If you have questions, please speak with  
12 the DEP representative at the conclusion of this hearing.  
13 What I plan to do is as I call your name, you don't have  
14 to come behind the podium or Atlas stand or whatever this  
15 is. But if you would come to the front and speak loudly  
16 and clearly so that the court reporter can hear you so we  
17 can accurately record what you say. So if there's any  
18 questions about the format of the hearing, we can go  
19 ahead and get started.

20                   No questions? Okay.

21                   The first speaker is Cynthia Ellis. After  
22 Cynthia is Vivian Stockmen.

23                   Thank you.

24                   MS. ELLIS: My name is Cynthia Ellis and I

1 live in northern Putnam County. The route of the  
2 proposed MXP is about a mile from my home. I understand  
3 that these hearings are intended to center upon aspects  
4 of the stormwater permit for the project. I also  
5 understand that some DEP staff would be pleased if I or  
6 any speaker could present facts and information that  
7 would allow them to deny this permit. I don't believe I  
8 can provide that data, but I appreciate the opportunity  
9 to speak.

10 On the other hand however, throughout the  
11 permitting process for the MXP, concerned citizens have  
12 felt that the process was hurried, and that information  
13 was hard to secure.

14 In the main, we feel we've had few  
15 opportunities to make the point that the MXP is not  
16 necessary. The project needs the stormwater permit to  
17 gain its certificate of necessity. But this line is for  
18 overseas export, not for the benefit of our state and  
19 communities and it promises only 29 permanent jobs for  
20 the 14 counties it traverses. It's not needed. We  
21 should have proceeded more slowly.

22 In North Carolina, concerning a large line  
23 that will cross public land in eastern West Virginia, a  
24 newspaper editorial says of that project, the project's

1 already more than a year behind schedule and now faces  
2 further delays as it waits for environmental permits.  
3 The project's backers don't like it, but the delays are a  
4 helpful test. If the project is truly needed, time  
5 should make that clearer. If it's not, as many argue,  
6 then time will reveal that as well. We should have held  
7 this project to the test more closely to the test of  
8 time.

9                   We needed more space. That is, we needed  
10 more hearings. A number of groups and individuals did  
11 submit requests that stormwater hearings be held in more  
12 than two locations. It requires little imagination to  
13 think that worried landowners, parents, and other  
14 citizens from the 14 impacted counties would have wanted  
15 to attend such an event and learn more. But for many,  
16 job constrains and other scheduling difficulties no doubt  
17 precluded traveling to Ripley or Doddridge County, the  
18 only two hearing locations.

19                   Those of us who have tried to do a little  
20 homework regarding stormwater concerns have learned that  
21 since the waivers for the 401, there will be more  
22 frequent inspections of the construction, but those will  
23 be done by contracted personnel, not the West Virginia  
24 DEP. However on the positive side, there will be

1 required inspections after one quarter inch of rain  
2 rather than a half an inch. We understand that rain  
3 gauges will be installed, but they'll be self-inspecting.  
4 We find that there will be wet stream crossings which  
5 has the potential for more sediment. Those other two  
6 very controversial projects in eastern West Virginia, the  
7 ACP and the MVP they call for dry crossings.

8                   The state of Virginia and the U.S.  
9 Geological Survey are working together to use new high  
10 technology methods for stream monitoring. Why not here?

11                   Rip Rap. I'm told that DEP does not look  
12 favorably on the use of rip rap for post-construction  
13 stream edges. I join any others who are requesting that  
14 DEP should insist upon natural stream design rather than  
15 rip rap.

16                   In 2016 Kellogg Economics made a survey of  
17 economic impacts to West Virginia and Virginia counties  
18 in jeopardy of the impacts from the ACP and the MVP.  
19 Their findings would likely hold for the MXP as well.  
20 That survey mentions a term I first heard in recent years  
21 from a young professor at Glenville State College,  
22 ecosystem services. This relates to the notions of  
23 economic costs and value regarding our land, water and  
24 air. I had to think of the disruption of construction on



1 the streams near me when I read these words from that  
2 survey.

3                   Regarding ecosystem services, the  
4 construction and presence of the MVP will alter the flow  
5 of natural benefits people receive from well-functioning,  
6 healthy ecosystems. These natural benefits include  
7 services such as clean water for drinking and for  
8 industrial processes, food grown on cropland, raw  
9 materials, and the aesthetic value of beautiful views  
10 from residential and commercial properties, as well as  
11 from areas used for recreation.

12                   Ecosystems also protect people and  
13 property from extreme events like floods and wildfire,  
14 regulate local and global climate, clean the air, support  
15 food production through natural pest control and  
16 pollination, provide wildlife to hunt, fish to catch, and  
17 spaces for other forms of recreation. The MXP will cause  
18 us to lose those ecosystem services.

19                   Let's look at safety and particularly  
20 post-construction impacts. We who have looked at the  
21 record of Columbia gas see some worrisome figures. Here  
22 are leaks and ruptures in natural gas lines for the years  
23 2010 through 2017 in West Virginia at Columbia lines and  
24 compressor stations. Flattop, compressor station 2017

1 total cleanup costs \$20,619. Lanham compressor station  
2 2014 total costs \$65,218. SM line rupture - the SM line  
3 rupture - the SM-80 line rupture due to corrosion at  
4 Sissonville 2012 ignited total costs \$4,276,318.  
5 Smithfield compressor station 2016 total costs \$49,816.  
6 Adaline compressor station 2012 total costs \$9,877. Lost  
7 River compressor station 2015 total costs \$15,359. Line  
8 8223 2015 total costs \$3,273. Line 8012 2011 total costs  
9 \$58,331. Smithfield pipeline 2014 total costs \$47,422.  
10 In addition to these clean-up costs totaling \$5,498,213,  
11 these leaks and ruptures have resulted in large methane  
12 emissions which contribute to climate extremes including  
13 floods.

14                   This information came from the Interactive  
15 map prepared with data from the Federal Pipeline and  
16 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

17                   On July 7, 2015 a Columbia pipeline  
18 construction accident fouled the public water system at  
19 Peterstown, West Virginia. Service to the community was  
20 disrupted for two and a half weeks. We do realize that  
21 Columbia was purchased last year by the TransCanada  
22 Company, and that company's record is also problematic.

23                   Some of us are participating in a stream  
24 monitoring program along the proposed route of MXP.

1 We've completed training conducted by Trout Unlimited and  
2 West Virginia Rivers Coalition. At least once a month we  
3 sample and survey a stream that will be crossed by or  
4 impacted by this pipeline construction. We log in our  
5 data on the CitSci.org website. This is a gratifying  
6 action and we're pleased to be able to add to what is  
7 currently known about the streams. Alternately, we wish  
8 our work with these waters was not prompted by concerns  
9 surrounding the streams. We urge DEP to be aware of our  
10 data.

11 Finally, as a birder in West Virginia for  
12 35 years, I must take every opportunity to speak up for  
13 the birds. Birds play a vital role in the health of our  
14 world as controller of insect populations and as  
15 pollinators and dispersers of seeds. Birders value all  
16 species, but they rate scant mention in the final EIS,  
17 the Environmental Impact Statement for the MXP. It does  
18 acknowledge the harm that will come to Cerulean Warblers  
19 in the Lewis Wetzel Wildlife Management Area, but it  
20 fails to note how construction practices and stream  
21 alteration will impact others.

22 Many of the waterways to be affected by  
23 the MXP are an important part of the habitat for our  
24 state's breeding and resident bird species. Stormwater

1 events and constructions mistakes may damage a wide  
2 circle of creatures and their habitat. It's regrettable  
3 that state and Federal regulations only focus on birds  
4 with declining populations or only use the Endangered  
5 Species Act or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as tools. A  
6 better approach would be to help all of us be aware of  
7 the interconnections and the multiple factors that  
8 guarantee the survival of birds and of ourselves.

9 My friends and I will continue that stream  
10 monitoring and I'll be continuing to encourage birders to  
11 make surveys around the route of the MXP. If the project  
12 proceeds, I'll be among those who will be visiting with  
13 cameras and data sheets. The plans for the MXP should  
14 have been reviewed more closely and its constructions and  
15 operation will require continued scrutiny.

16 CHAIR: Up next is Vivian Stockmen. After  
17 Vivian is Robin Blakeman.

18 MS. STOCKMEN: I agree with Cindy. Oh,  
19 Vivian Stockmen. I'm with the Ohio Valley Environmental  
20 Coalition which is based in Huntington, West Virginia. I  
21 agree with Cindy that this process has been hurried and I  
22 would like some more time. I would especially like to  
23 request that the written comment period be extended  
24 beyond the holidays. We will have some more technical

1 comments. I really haven't had the time to review the  
2 permit as much as I would like at this time.

3 I believe it was a lack of people here. I  
4 heard there was in Doddridge, too, a lack of citizens out  
5 tonight. And I think one reason that there's a lack of  
6 citizens, they're pretty much convinced that the DEP  
7 doesn't really hear them and will issue this permit no  
8 matter what the citizens say. I think the citizens see  
9 Governor Jim Justice and the DEP head Caperton as  
10 enablers of the fossil fuel corporations that are  
11 applying for these permits and pretty much as hostile to  
12 actual protection of human health and well-being.

13 I would implore DEP to examine the  
14 cumulative effects of this permit, not just as a stand-  
15 alone permit. The reason I say this is you know, DEP  
16 should really step back and develop a way to look at  
17 these type of permits in aggregate, because the myriad of  
18 wet and dry gas pipelines that are proposed for our area,  
19 coupled with all the increased fracking and related  
20 activities that would feed these pipelines, those  
21 cumulative impacts have a great effect on the land and  
22 water and surely are changing the runoff patterns. So I  
23 don't think these can be examined as stand-alone. I  
24 don't know how DEP could do this, but I wish they would

1 develop a way to look at the cumulative impacts of these  
2 permits they're issuing.

3           The increased fossil fuel infrastructure  
4 and supply build out may well intensify storm events.  
5 We're talking about cumulative impacts for stormwater and  
6 building of climate change from all these sort of fossil  
7 fuel operations that could - the climate change impacts  
8 could include more stormwater than stronger stormwater  
9 events.

10           This photo is of one incident. I don't  
11 know if it can be entered into the record. I know DEP  
12 already has this photo. This is an incident, a  
13 stormwater incident from the Rover pipeline. The Rover  
14 pipeline did get its - obviously its stormwater permit  
15 and it is obviously an inadequate permit. Were it not  
16 for citizen monitoring and citizen reporting, this  
17 inadequacy in Rover's permit would not have gotten -  
18 would have gone unnoticed and would have not been - the  
19 Rover pipeline company would not have been punished for  
20 this activity.

21           In light of lessons learned from the  
22 multiple events with Rover, I hope that DEP will slow  
23 down, revisit the MXP stormwater permit, look at the  
24 lessons learned here, see how the permit could be

1 enhanced based on these lessons that we've learned from  
2 Rover. And I would hope that DEP is not depending on  
3 citizen watchdogs but rather on inspectors with DEP to  
4 provide this data. I don't think it should be on the  
5 burden of the citizens, and I'm pretty sure I don't trust  
6 the pipeline companies to be providing the inspectors.  
7 So I'm hoping that DEP can get funding for more  
8 inspectors.

9                   So I think that this particular permit,  
10 the wet trench crossing methods proposed for the minor  
11 water bodies that DEP has examined how there could be  
12 increased sedimentation in some of these streams. One of  
13 the streams I'm monitoring in Roane County has a lot of  
14 mussels in it. And I think the increased sedimentation  
15 could be of great danger. I am not sure yet if DEP has  
16 examined the mussels in this particular stream. I need  
17 more time to look at the stormwater permit.

18                   I don't think there's any water quality  
19 monitoring proposed. There should be some monitors  
20 installed at sensitive stream crossings. Again, I'd like  
21 to ask for some more time to complete more technical  
22 comments. Thank you.

23                   CHAIR: Next is Robin Blackman. After  
24 Robin is Mark Connelly.

1                   MS. BLAKEMAN: Okay.

2                   I'm just going to stand because I had to  
3 drive two, over two hours to get here from Huntington,  
4 West Virginia area because there's not a hearing in our  
5 area, even though we are part of the most extensively  
6 populated counties that this project will be going  
7 through. My name is Robin Blakeman. I work for OHVEC,  
8 the same organization that Vivian Stockmen does. I'm  
9 also here representing the faith-based organization  
10 called West Virginia Interfaith Power and Light who is  
11 gravely concerned about all the pipelines that are being  
12 developed in West Virginia in terms of the cumulative  
13 impact.

14                   So first and foremost, I would like to  
15 request an extension of time for written comments for  
16 this - on this permit. At the very least until January  
17 2nd, after the holidays, and hopefully longer than that,  
18 so that people will have a chance to review the extensive  
19 nature of the documents for this project. I would like  
20 to request again, even though this request has been  
21 denied, myself and several others have made it, that  
22 there be at least one public hearing scheduled in Putnam,  
23 Cabell, or Wayne Counties.

24                   The extensive nature of the documents for



1 this massive project, which I've already mentioned,  
2 necessitate a lengthier period of time for public  
3 analysis of the data and information available. And we  
4 simply haven't had enough time to read and analyze this  
5 information to date.

6           The increased population density in the  
7 most southerly counties to be impacted by this project is  
8 a major reason for my request to hold another hearing in  
9 one of the counties - to allow for the increased number  
10 of citizens who stand to be impacted by this project.

11           The amount of acreage to be disturbed by  
12 this project gives me pause. From the final E&S  
13 narrative statistics, I calculated that a total of  
14 2,721.5 acres will be disturbed by this pipeline. 128.5  
15 for above ground facilities, 301.9 for access roads, and  
16 496 for staging areas and contractor yards. This is a  
17 total of 3,647.9 acres.

18           With the massive disturbance of West  
19 Virginia soils underway for not only this pipeline, but a  
20 multitude of others proliferating across the state, we  
21 would strongly encourage a cumulative impact study on the  
22 runoff contamination potential of this project prior to  
23 its approval.

24           When paired with the cumulative impact

1 potential from many other projects, we believe the  
2 waterways of West Virginia are endangered. Water is our  
3 most precious resource in this state, and the absolute  
4 best practices and regulatory enforcement levels are  
5 necessary to protect it at this point in time.

6 Therefore, I want to make sure the following points are  
7 addressed prior to the approval of this project.

8           First, due to the steep terrain of this  
9 project that is proposed to traverse, traditional means  
10 of erosion control such as silt fences and socks have  
11 largely proven inadequate on multiple other similar  
12 projects like the Rover which Vivian mentioned a little  
13 while ago. And I have additional pictures from the Rover  
14 project where we have erosion issues going on as we speak  
15 on that project. Here we have some erosion control  
16 methods failing. And I'll enter these into the record  
17 with my comments.

18           I also have some examples from Cabell  
19 County where right now we have renovation projects  
20 underway on the SM-80 line, which is the tie-in line for  
21 the Mountaineer Xpress Pipeline. And if SM-80 sounds at  
22 all familiar to anyone here who's from the Sissonville  
23 area, it is the pipeline that exploded several years ago.

24           First of all, this is in the SM-80

1 territory near Davis Creek Elementary. They have a silt  
2 fence failing. It's been there for a long while. This  
3 is a - actually a completed site where they did a small  
4 section there, but it is failing, and the creek is - it's  
5 extensively eroding. This is something that I've already  
6 reported to DEP officials in the Cabell County area.

7           There's a picture of the stream erosion  
8 that has occurred behind Davis Creek Elementary because  
9 of this project. And on Grapevine branch, we have  
10 another example of silt fence failure recently. These  
11 pictures were all taken last week. So this is not in any  
12 way dated material. This is - this is very current  
13 pictures and material.

14           So with all the failures that are possible  
15 with the erosion control methods that are traditionally  
16 used, I request that the DEP embark on water testing in  
17 all streams that this project is proposed to traverse. I  
18 want this implemented prior to initial construction on  
19 the project, so that there can be baseline water sampling  
20 data obtained and periodic, at least monthly, water tests  
21 to be implemented at those sites during the duration of  
22 construction and initial startup phases of this project.

23           And I request that this be done at cost to  
24 the construction and/or pipeline operating corporations

1 and that water quality analytical means include testing  
2 for heavy metals such as lead, arsenic, and selenium.

3 I request that the test results be made  
4 available to the public in a timely manner, within two  
5 weeks of official receipt of the test result data. I  
6 request that there be at least monthly site visits from  
7 DEP on all active construction locations for this  
8 project. And that members of the public citizens of West  
9 Virginia may be allowed to accompany DEP officials on  
10 these visits upon request.

11 I'm well aware that the DEP is - is way  
12 understaffed and therefore some additional funding for  
13 the DEP would be part of my request, either at industry  
14 cost or through state funding means. I'm aware that  
15 there are endangered mussel species in some streams that  
16 this project is proposed to traverse. Therefore, I would  
17 request that there be a full analysis of species to be  
18 impacted in all these streams prior to any consideration  
19 of approval of this permit and ongoing monitoring.

20 In the end I am opposed to approval of  
21 this permit, but I hope that these - these considerations  
22 will be taken under advisement. Thank you.

23 CHAIR: Next is Mark Connelly. And after  
24 Mark is Eve Marcum-Atkinson.

1                   MR. CONNELLY: I'm Mark Connelly. I'm  
2 with Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition. I also  
3 represent Fourpole Creek Watershed Association. Both are  
4 located in Huntington, West Virginia. I just had to  
5 travel two hours - or over two hours to get to this  
6 meeting, so I am requesting we have another meeting in a  
7 more populated area that would be affected by this  
8 project, either in Cabell, Wayne or Putnam Counties.  
9 I've prepared a statement I'm going to read. I don't  
10 speak as well as some of these people, so I'll just read  
11 off these papers.

12                   When the health and lives of citizens is  
13 superseded by the profits and greed of corporations and  
14 stockholders, then we have a major ethical problem in our  
15 region, state and country. The process of obtaining and  
16 transporting our resources is an old concern of this  
17 area. Our resources have caused us many social and  
18 health problems through the years. The permitting of  
19 this this pipeline or this permit, WVR301A72, will allow  
20 another attack upon our people.

21                   Five years ago a leaking natural gas  
22 pipeline owned by Columbia Gas exploded near Sissonville,  
23 West Virginia melting four lanes of Interstate 77,  
24 flattening four homes, and damaging five other homes.

1 Only by the grace of God were lives spared when this  
2 happened.

3           As I see it, pipelines are good for two  
4 things. Traveling resources through them and leaking.  
5 So when pipelines leak, particularly under pressure,  
6 fireballs can happen, interstates can melt, and people  
7 can expire.

8           In section six of this application,  
9 there's a satellite photo that shows this pipeline very  
10 close to residential dwellings. If this pipeline  
11 ruptures, how many people will be lost to the huge  
12 fireball that may occur? Only by the grace of God did we  
13 not lose people the last time this happened.

14           With nearly 4,000 acres being disturbed, a  
15 pipeline close to a home, a church, and developments both  
16 existing and developments that will be made in the  
17 future, then and will be destroyed. Deaths from these  
18 explosions are inevitable.

19           I have looked over this application,  
20 WVR301A72 and have many questions. Section three does  
21 not list the name of any information about any contractor  
22 who will be contracted to build this pipeline. I see  
23 that 60 days before the start date, a site registration  
24 application and erosion and sediment control plan and a

1 stormwater pollution and prevention plan needed to be  
2 submitted before 2/21/17. That is February 21st, 2017.  
3 There's no mention that these - these criteria have been  
4 met in the application.

5 In section four, the preparer of this form  
6 is Emma Suberniak of Arcadis, which I assume is a company  
7 in Highlands, Colorado. Her contact phone number is a  
8 304 number, which is the area code for West Virginia  
9 which is very inconsistent with her Highlands, excuse,  
10 me, Highlands Ranch, Colorado. Why is this the area code  
11 of this preparer?

12 Section five shows a fee of 1,750. It  
13 does not say dollars. I'm assuming it is dollars. This  
14 was - this was levied, but there's no mention whether  
15 this fee was paid or whether it just goes unpaid.

16 Now we know the Transcanada Company built  
17 the Dakota pipeline that recently spilled 2,110 gallons  
18 of tar sands oil, the dirtiest oil known. This could  
19 have a very toxic effect on groundwater. Are we supposed  
20 to trust our future to Columbia Gas or Transcanada? I  
21 for one do not think so. Thank you very much.

22 CHAIR: Up next is Eve Marcum-Atkinson.  
23 Eve is the last person to have signed up to speak. If  
24 you came in and you said you did not want to speak, but

1 now you do, that's okay. Just come up here and I can  
2 mark off no and put yes. But Eve, you're up.

3 MS. MARCUM-ATKINSON: Good evening. My  
4 name is Eve Marcum-Atkinson. I'm with West Virginia  
5 Rivers and what I want to say is going to reiterate some  
6 of the things others have already stated. But in the end  
7 I'm just going to make a concise list of some of the  
8 issues that West Virginia Rivers has found with this  
9 permit application. And if there are this many issues,  
10 we are hoping the DEP will consider not accepting the  
11 application and asking for these issues to be resolved  
12 prior to reapplying.

13 The applicant has not demonstrated that  
14 impacts to water quality has been minimized. Trench,  
15 what trench crossing methods are proposed for minor water  
16 bodies causing increased sedimentation in streams.  
17 Impaired streams crossed by what trench methods will  
18 exceed water quality standards and be unable to meet the  
19 total maximum daily load pollution prevention  
20 requirements. The use of rip rap is proposed for stream  
21 restoration instead of West Virginia DEP's preferred  
22 method of restoration using natural stream channel design  
23 techniques. The engineering calculations for the sizing  
24 of culverts are not included in the application. The



1 site specific spacing distances for trench line barriers  
2 are not included in the application. And no water  
3 quality monitoring is proposed.

4 Monitors should be installed at sensitive  
5 stream crossings similar to the efforts being conducted  
6 along the proposed pipeline routes in Virginia. We have  
7 an example that we could follow for that. It's a simple  
8 request, but we do at least what Virginia is doing in  
9 this case. Because of this and many of the other issues  
10 that we have stated today, I do not believe that the  
11 MXP's application - I don't believe that it meets the  
12 requirements for the West Virginia DEP oil and gas  
13 construction stormwater general permit. Thank you.

14 CHAIR: Okay. Eve was the last person to  
15 sign up to speak, but if there's anybody else who wants  
16 to speak? What we're going to do, I think since we only  
17 had one, two, three, four, five. What we normally do at  
18 this point would take about a 15-minute break in case  
19 people were late getting here to give more people a  
20 chance to arrive. So we're going to kind of take a 15  
21 minute timeout and we will rejoin in about 15 minutes.

22 ---

23 (WHEREUPON, A PAUSE IN THE RECORD WAS HELD.)

24 ---

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

CHAIR: Okay everyone. We've waited 15 minutes. And is there anybody else who wishes to speak tonight? If not, that concludes this public hearing on the Mountaineer Xpress pipeline's construction stormwater permit. The comment period ends on December 22nd. If you wish to receive a copy of the comments and responses, please make sure your e-mail address is on this sign-in sheet and that you've written legibly. Thank you for your participation. Have a safe drive home.

\* \* \* \* \*

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 7:02 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 I hereby certify, as the stenographic reporter,  
4 that the foregoing proceedings were taken stenographically  
5 by me, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or  
6 under my direction; and that this transcript is a true and  
7 accurate record to the best of my ability.

8

9 I certify that the attached transcript meets the  
10 requirements set forth within article twenty-seven,  
11 chapter forty-seven of the West Virginia Code.

12

13

14

15

  
Caroline Swanson,

16

Court Reporter

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24