

## Atlantic Coast Pipeline Scoping Meeting Comments

Bill Limpert 5/21/16

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, and specifically the GWNF-6 alternative. This is a potentially life changing project for my wife and I, our neighbors, and many, many other people who may be impacted if this project is approved. This project is not in the public interest, and should be rejected. There are many adverse impacts associated with this project. I see no positive impact.

My wife and I built our retirement home at 250 Fern Gully Lane in Little Valley, Bath County. We purchased this property seven years ago. It is the most beautiful place that we have seen. It is almost completely forested, and a large part of the forest is old growth. We have a view looking many miles to the north with mountains on three sides. It is the quietest place that we know. The air quality is absolutely the best that we have ever experienced. We built our home here 4 years ago. If the pipeline goes in as proposed we will have to abandon our retirement home and property.

I am particularly concerned about our personal safety. The pipeline as currently proposed will be on the adjacent ridge, within 700 feet of our home, well within the blast zone, and we will not be able to escape the evacuation zone since our home is located above the pipe near the head of Little Valley where the public road dead ends well within the evacuation zone. In fact, if we were to survive the initial blast we would have to drive on our steep gravel access road within 200 feet of the pipe in order to make it out to the public road, and we would still be trapped. At least five other neighboring properties would also be trapped. I have requested information from FERC about the total number of people in jeopardy from this pipeline, and have not been given an answer. I estimate that number in the tens of thousands.

A gas pipeline of this size has never been placed through such steep slopes and karst terrain as we have in Little Valley. In fact, Dominion representatives testified to the Augusta County Board of Supervisors that they would not put the pipe through Bath County because of the steep topography and the sinkholes. Slopes on both sides of the valley approach 80 % with many areas where the pipeline is proposed at 60%. There have been numerous landslides in this area, including a large one that we have documented at 500 feet by 35 feet by as deep as 10 feet on the east side of Little Mountain, and within several hundred feet of the current route of the proposed pipeline. The pipeline would cross Little Valley Run, which flooded severely last summer, moved rocks 5 feet long, and relocated its channel just downstream of the proposed pipe crossing. There are sinkholes in Little Valley in the path of the pipeline. Numerous regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations pertaining to pipeline safety call for extraordinary safety measures and outright relocation of gas pipelines in an area such as this. These regulations are also detailed in my written comments.

Our property value has dropped by \$200,000 to \$300,000 since the pipeline was proposed. It would create a clearcut through a forest of 150 year old trees, which I am

sure is the oldest forest along the entire length of the line. Most people have never seen a forest this old. It would bisect our property, and eliminate any chance we would have of subdividing it. I have requested a calculation of total property value losses for the entire length of the line from FERC, and have not been given an answer. I have estimated at least \$1 billion in property value losses.

There is no public drinking water in Little Valley, or in fact, anywhere along the line in Bath County. Everyone uses springs or wells for their drinking water. We use a well. The karst terrain in Little Valley, and elsewhere in Bath County makes our drinking water supplies vulnerable to being polluted, reduced, or completely dried up. Blasting, which would be required for the pipeline, could easily cause soil movement underground cutting off flow to springs and wells. I previously attached a report from geologist William Jones in my comments which detail these concerns.

Likewise, due to the steep slopes and erodible soils, also reported by Mr. Jones, the likelihood of massive sediment runoff to Little Valley Run, and to our drinking water supplies is high. The likelihood of pollution from fuel spills, hydrostatic testing, and other toxic liquids which will collect in the pipe in the center of Little Valley is also very high.

The pipeline is not needed. ACP claims it is needed to serve an urgent need for energy in Virginia and North Carolina. There is no urgent need for energy. Both states have reduced energy consumption in the past decade. Any loss of energy from closing coal fired power plants could be made up by conservation, renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, geothermal, and retrofit hydroelectric, or even oil, since we currently have a glut of oil in our country, more than at any time in the past 90 years, and we are currently shipping oil overseas. I feel confident, despite what ACP is telling FERC, that the gas to be carried by this pipeline will also be sent overseas at great profit.

Even if the gas was needed there are numerous other gas pipelines already in place that could transport the gas from the Marcellus shale fields. These pipelines are not running near capacity. If the ACP is built we will have a surplus of underused pipelines. Why disrupt and jeopardize the lives of thousands and thousands of people to build a pipeline that is not needed? I urge FERC to conduct a programmatic environmental impact statement to assess the true need for this pipeline.

Construction of this pipeline will result in more greenhouse gas pollution to our already polluted atmosphere, and hasten and intensify the severe impacts of climate change. It will delay the urgent implementation of renewable energy resources which contribute no greenhouse gas pollution. When renewable energy systems are in place, except for minor maintenance costs, they provide free, inexhaustible energy with no pollution.

A reasonable and viable alternative to this project includes not building the pipeline, and using renewable energy sources, possibly augmented with limited and strongly regulated natural gas through existing pipelines.

In summary, this pipeline is not needed, and is not in the public interest. It is safety risk

for many people. It has reduced property values for many people. It jeopardizes the water supply for many people. It will pollute our water and air. It will contribute to the catastrophic effects of climate change.

My written comments cover numerous other adverse impacts, and provide details and supporting information.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

William F. Limpert  
4102B Garfield Road  
Smithsburg, MD 21783  
301-416-0571  
250 Fern Gully Lane  
Warm Springs, VA 24484  
540-839-3202  
wflimpert@gmail.com  
Intervenor #320783