

Pipeline Awareness and Engagement Public Meeting
Webcast Submitted Questions and Comments
June 12-13, 2019

1. As a landowner being forced to accept a 42-inch high-pressure pipeline for 1.1 mile through the very center of my family's 117-year-old business without any consideration of our use of our land or our safety, I am very disturbed as this session ends. It appears that our needs are simply ignored and that our access to information is once again hidden under proprietary blankets. I believe we deserve the very best safety possible. Our land is being taken for a non-proven public need, and the gas is likely to be exported for private gain only. We have no choices. The company has not worked with us AT ALL concerning our uses/needs/plans for OUR property. The safety risk level is set based upon what the company would lose, not what a loss could mean to us. If something goes wrong, we could lose everything we have, including our lives. We are only 4 miles after the compressor station and have been denied closer cut off valves, thicker pipe, or moving the line so our buildings (many from 1804) are on the edge rather than the middle of the incineration zone. The level to which PHMSA clearly supports the industry is already appalling and this meeting just began. The lead times you're discussing for the industry are appalling given what they mean for the public. The 2011 safety law is still not implemented and pipelines are going in the ground at record pace. I currently live in the evacuation zone of the MVP. My family's business, where I planned to retire, is bisected by the ACP and all of our homes and farm buildings are in the incineration zone given the path the company has chosen. I've been involved and active for the entire 5 years of this process so far, seeking some level of protection for myself and my communities. I am very disgusted with the lack of consideration for the people who are being put in danger, against our will, without on-going compensation (sharing of the earnings from our land) and with no way to get information or influence the decisions. The whole system is built against landowners and communities. I seek change.

2. How could you engage communities early in the processes where pipelines are proposed to help ensure that everyone understands the safety implications? Aren't you limited by staff numbers and the huge number of pipelines that are currently proposed - and honestly, will the industry allow true engagement and true understanding. It seems that the industry wants the public to trust them and not worry. They don't want to share the information that folks deserve to know. We've got a two-tier safety system caused by lack of resources.

How can we get the industry to allow the public to get enough information – from the start of a pipeline proposal – to really understand instead of them hiding information to avoid getting into trouble/ control everything by being the only information entity?

3. I am attaching my answers (see breakout session input below) for the second part of the breakout. You should know that I serve on the FCC Consumer Advisory Committee and have served on several other such state and federal groups. I am concerned that you are using a format that is like those groups but that you want to avoid making it a real group. Given the lack of advance notice about this event, and the last-minute provision of the agenda, you'd be better served if the requirements for Notice in the Federal Register, etc. would be useful. I only found out about this meeting because PST (Carl) shared an email very recently. I was not able to attend in person or today, even participate virtually due to other obligations. To get the frontline affected people, who I believe should be your target, you needed to use other ways of communicating and needed to provide a longer timeline/ advance notice of the meeting AND its agenda. I will submit to the docket. I am willing to discuss any of this with you. I just cannot do it today. Property I own and live on and plan to live on is affected by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the Mountain Valley Pipeline. I am affiliated with grassroots groups along each pipeline and the multi-county, multi-state groups that have formed along each. I'm also connected with people like me across the nation. These are the people with whom you need to engage. You truly need to understand us and our needs and not accept the industry's representation of us. We deserve safety. We are being forced to live with dangerous infrastructure over which we have no ability to make or influence decisions about our safety. There is too much interest and focus on the industry, too little on us, the citizen's government should be protecting.

4. I was at the Workshop until lunch today and appreciate PHMSA's efforts in gathering input. I have some additional comments, as follow:

- Pipeline siting and construction seem to be such large issues that they warrant a workshop and/or working group dedicated solely to those topics.
- Although the differences between interstate pipelines and LDCs is significant, LDCs rely on interstate gas pipelines for supply and have on-going relationships with stakeholder audiences in areas along the pipelines that could enhance the pipelines' engagement efforts in these areas.
- If the proposed Engagement Working Group is formed, public gas systems should have a seat. Also consider including a representative for Master Meter Operators, since they often include concentrated groups of the public and are required to have a Public Awareness Procedure, even though they are not subject to RP 1162.
- Awareness and engagement can be greatly improved through collaborative efforts. Things that can be made consistent and delivered or conducted jointly should be to avoid conflicting information, competing efforts, and information overload.

5. On May 16, Joseph Elligson of Roanoke posited that those opposed to the natural gas pipelines obstruct economic contributions from manufacturing ("No proposed alternatives").

What specific business is actually building new or expanded manufacturing to use this gas? Please prove the need, that current infrastructure is inadequate, the new infrastructure will be fully used for its entire lifecycle, and that it will not harm the environment or health. Only Franklin County expects new access to natural gas but where are specific plans for new industry or residential distribution? Because Buckingham County has had gas transmission without local use for more than 50 years, I am skeptical. Eminent domain is intended for projects that provide public benefit, not private profits. We've heard many grandiose benefit projections but seen no proof any will materialize. Given global markets, it appears that the gas will be exported, increasing currently low U.S. prices.

Pipeline supporters should be willing to pay costs of:

- additional federal taxes to finally allow the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) to do its congressionally mandated job;
- rescinding instructions that save taxes but result in lower safety standards and pipeline oversight in rural areas than in urban;
- implementing safety rules passed by Congress in 2011, replacing essentially industry self-regulation under rules made long before large (42-inch) high pressure pipelines and fracking existed;
- ensuring if the water supply is hurt it is permanently replaced without unreasonable denials or court challenges;
- annual payments to landowners (not just a one-time easement payment), payment of annual property tax on land used, insurance to protect the landowner if anything goes wrong, and prompt removal of unused infrastructure from the property;
- thorough review of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) rules and processes, requiring fair landowner treatment and respect for landowner heritage and use of their land;
- conducting robust health and environmental testing before construction;
- vigilantly monitoring all potentially harmful emissions;
- telling no one "You can afford the pollution;"
- guaranteeing lifetime care and compensation when health is damaged.

Until major changes are made, pipeline supporters dare not make trite NIMBY complaints or accuse opponents of obstructing economic progress.

*****Breakout Session Input from the Webcast*****

Pipeline Awareness and Engagement Public Meeting

Breakout Session Questions

Pipeline Safety Awareness and Engagement Group Charter Questions:

1. What do you think the group should focus on?

One way communication for awareness. Engagement is two way - beyond one question/answer.

Helping communities and individuals understand pipeline safety, how to access current information, where infrastructure is in their work/living areas. Since you don't want actionable recommendations from the group, who and what of substance do you want from it? How will this proposal result in solving the problem that exists of the gap between the frontline people and communities and the industry? Is this more than window-dressing?

2. What do you think the group should not focus on?

Those who have concern - who know enough TO have concern. Industry priorities for keeping information from the public

3. What would the group not be able to address that you are concerned about?

Keeping industry from dominating and taking over the group/its work/outcomes

4. What other organizations or groups should be represented?

All parties but especially government.

You really need to connect with the landowners, residents, first responders, and local government people who are on the front line. The gap is huge – illustrated by the fact that PST and others withdrew from the API RP 1162 process as described yesterday as well as the fact that only one non-industry speaker was involved yesterday.

5. How should group members be selected by PHMSA?

PHMSA must be neutral - not an extension of the industry. Right now, it has the reputation of being controlled by the industry.

Industry needs to change its attitude from one of "we are entitled to take your property and do what we want. Your needs don't matter. You must just accept this. IF they want to "use" or "share" MY property, they need to recognize and work with me on MY goals for MY property, attempting to create a WIN-WIN not the current industry WINS - landowner LOSES and does

not dare to challenge industry in any way without severe consequences (either in terms of the legal system/police and/or company refusal to do anything the landowner requests).

Work with PST, and the grassroots groups involved in areas where pipelines are and are being developed. These are not just environmental groups. Cooperative Extension in those areas can also help identify local leaders. Likewise, first responders. People involved with local government - water, transportation, etc.

Be sure the group members really live every day with the pipeline infrastructure and care about safety – not just industry and its profits. The industry needs to really “hear” and “understand” these people and communities. Right now, industry simply imposes its demands upon the people. In my experience, even when industry hosts meetings, it controls the agenda and who is there and has absolutely no interest in what the community thinks. The industry thinks letting community members select paint color of buildings that will be placed in its midst is engagement. The industry thinks it has the right to just impose its will on landowners and communities without even attempting to understand the community or the landowners and our goals/needs. They already know what is required. They don't have to consider us.

Currently, folks even in the incineration zone of pipelines are only engaged if their land is crossed. The processes are designed to keep information private and keep communities from knowing anything until things are in the ground and operating. Even then, information is classified as “proprietary” or “sensitive for avoiding terrorist activity” or whatever other excuse can be found to keep those who are most affected from really understanding and absolutely prohibiting us from having ANY way to influence decisions. The attitude given to citizens is “we know best and we will look out for your interests – stay out of it.”

The structure for the group that you propose will simply make the status quo continue. It will not resolve the issues you perceive, rightly, are there with the true ultimate audience. The gap that exists is in involvement and engagement of the front-line people and communities.

6. Who would best engage with you regarding pipeline safety matters?

Someone/ an entity I trust. This is not any of the industry or government entities currently involved because my experience shows me that my concerns are not theirs and they are only focused on industry outcomes.

7. What are your expectations of successful or positive engagement?

Timely and recognize I'm doing lots of other things

They seem to "hear" my concerns

They try to create a WIN-WIN

There is follow-up - and more than one interaction

There is follow-up - and more than one interaction

8. What is working well with regards to engagement?
9. What perceived gaps or barriers exist with regards to engagement?
10. How can these perceived gaps or barriers be improved?