

TO: The Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: F. Craig Meadows, County Administrator  
L. Carol Edmonds, Deputy County Administrator

DATE: June 15, 2015

**SUBJECT: AGENDA REPORT**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. INVOCATION**

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**IV. INTO WORK SESSION**

BE IT RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors hereby enters into Work Session for the purpose of discussing the following:

1. Mountain Valley Pipeline

**V. OUT OF WORK SESSION**

BE IT RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors ends their Work Session to return to Regular Session.

**VI. PUBLIC ADDRESS**

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. SUBJECT: MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE**

#### **R-FY-15- RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, VIRGINIA**

WHEREAS, Mountain Valley Pipeline has initiated the Federal regulatory approval process to construct and operate a 300 mile long 42 inch diameter natural gas transmission pipeline between Wetzel, West Virginia (Marcellus and Utica production regions) and Pittsylvania County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, Mountain Valley Pipeline has advised FERC in its pre-filing application that Mountain Valley Pipeline's current proposed route parallels the existing 138 kV AEP Glen Lynn Hancock power line that traverses through Montgomery County starting at the Giles County border with the George Washington Jefferson National Forest heading southwest through Montgomery County to Roanoke County border near Interstate I-81; and

WHEREAS, On November 12, 2014, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia adopted a resolution opposing the Mountain Valley Pipeline proposed gas pipeline route for the following reasons:

- the proposed route will have an adverse impact on a large number of developed residences in the highly developed subdivisions of Brush Mountain Estates and Preston Forest;
- several federal and/or state endangered species with habitats are located within a three mile radius of the proposed pipeline route;
- large portion of the geology where the pipeline route is proposed through Montgomery County is characterized by karst terrain, sink holes, caves and two major fault lines increasing the potential of seismological activity;
- there are two AFD Districts, AFD#2 Catawba and AFD#9 Elliston/Pedlar Hills that would be bisected by the proposed route;
- there are two waterways, the North Fork of the Roanoke River and Craig's Creek that flow within the proposed pipeline route that will be affected.

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors remain on record opposing all the proposed routes of the Mountain Valley Pipeline however, the Board of Supervisors recognize that if FERC approves the project there are alternative routes proposed that have less impact on the environment and citizens of Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, In April 2015 Mountain Valley Pipeline identified in its Draft Resource Report 10 filed with FERC Alternate Routes 110 and 93 as possible alternatives to the proposed route as a result of ongoing consultations with landowners, local representatives and land management agencies during the initial open house meeting held in December 2014 and January 2015; and

WHEREAS, Alternate Route 110 appears to have less impact on the environment since Alternate Route 110 is less total miles in length resulting in a reduction in acreage disturbed by pipeline construction, with fewer landowner parcels and populated residential areas affected, avoids historic districts and limits the impact on forested lands; and

WHEREAS, Although Alternative Route 110 crosses more National Forest land, Alternative Route 110 avoids areas of karst geology, the Pembroke Fault Zone and several mapped caves, and the pipeline would no longer traverse the Preston Forest and Brush Mountain residential neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, Alternative Route 110 is a better option than Alternative Route 93, however if Alternative Route 110 is not approved, Alternate Route 93 is a better option than the portion of the original proposed route; and

WHEREAS, Alternative Route 93 has been identified by Mountain Valley Pipeline based on concerns expressed by landowners during the early scoping process as a possible route to avoid pipeline construction near a number of residences in the Preston Forest neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors recognizes that Alternative Route 93 has the same environmental impacts as the proposed route, if the proposed route moves forward and Alternate 110 is not an option, Alternate Route 93 would at least avoid a number of residences in Preston Forest neighborhood.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia that the Board of Supervisors hereby reiterates the Board's opposition to the proposed routes of the Mountain Valley Pipeline because the damage to the environment identified in the Boards' previous resolution adopted in November, 2014 far outweighs any economic benefit the pipeline may bring to Montgomery County or the Region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors recognize if FERC approves the pipeline, Alternative Route 110 is a better option than the portion of the proposed original route it would replace because it is less total miles in length resulting in a reduction in acreage disturbed by construction, with fewer landowner parcels and populated residential areas affected, avoids historic districts and limits the impact on forested lands.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors that the Board likewise recognizes that if FERC approves the pipeline and Alternative Route 110 is not selected, Alternative Route 93 would at least avoid pipeline construction near a number of residences in the Preston Forest neighborhood.

JUSTIFICATION: This resolution is placed on the agenda at the request of Supervisor Chris Tuck.

**VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**FUTURE MEETINGS**

Adjourned Meeting  
Monday, June 22, 2015  
6:00 p.m. – Closed Meeting Items  
7:15 Regular Agenda

Regular Meeting  
Monday, July 13, 2015  
6:00 p.m. – Closed Meeting Items  
7:15 Regular Agenda