



VOLUME IIB

ATTACHMENT 1C

Summary of Comments

Summary of Comments Received: March 24, 2015 through June 4, 2015

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
Clarington Lateral								
4/28/2015	Elisabeth	New Athens, OH	20150428-5025	Requests that do not grant ET Rover eminent domain. ET Rover should be ashamed of themselves for sending out false documents claiming to be researching bats and then claiming to already have eminent domain.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	Commenter was not definitively identified as an affected landowner (New Athens, OH) on the landowner mailing list. Eminent domain is addressed in RR8. Bat surveys are addressed in RR3.
Majorsville Lateral								
4/16/2015	Henry Roth	Wheeling, WV	20150416-5127	Last week two more pipelines ruptured in Marshall County, WV, see enclosed news articles; the one is located on Little Grave Creek. The proposed Majorsville Lateral is also following Little Grave Creek. As stated in my previous submissions, this proves that the area is unstable and not capable of supporting a pipeline of this size and pressure. Timber would be removed from slopes greater than 50% which in wet weather would result in slips and damage to the pipe, what happened last week to Williams Pipeline. There are much better and safer areas to build the pipeline. Pipelines of this type have never been built in this area and with the amount of accidents that have occurred in the last 5 years in the Ohio Valley, it's FERC's responsibility to intercede and provide safety for the public.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	WV-MA-ML-044.000 WV-MA-ML-046.000	Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Soil stabilization on steep slopes is addressed in RR7. Rover has employed a geo-professional (geologist or engineer) to evaluate the pipeline routes for areas of high landslide susceptibility and identify any site-specific construction or restoration procedures that should be implemented in high risk areas to limit the potential for landslides.
5/18/2015	Henry Roth	Wheeling, WV	20150518-5024	Questioned why he was given 21 days to accept Rover's offer and whether this is a FERC policy or Willbros Engineering strong arm tactic.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	WV-MA-ML-044.000 WV-MA-ML-046.000	Twenty-one days is a standard amount of time to request a landowner response. Rover will negotiate with landowners in good faith.
5/11/2015	Dale H Markowitz for Paul Melanko, Jr. and J. Joseph Munjas	Belmont County, Clarington or Majorsville	20150511-5067	Notice of intervention. Intervener's participation in this proceeding is on the grounds that Interveners as parties have a substantial interest in the location of the pipeline and is directly impacted as the real owners of the property Rover intends to install a 24-inch natural gas pipeline. Interveners have invested a significant amount of capital and resources improving the parcels to subdivide for residential development. The two parcels are prime property for residential development in the Village of Shadyside, Belmont County, Ohio because of the location on hilltop overlooking the valleys and the Ohio River. Interveners were unaware of FERC proceedings until after the deadline, since Rover did not utilize a current address for Interveners to advise of proceeding. Thus good cause exists for filing of Motion after the March 30, 2015 deadline. Interveners proposed alternate routes.	CP15-93-000	Landowners	OH-BE-ML-009.000 and 009.200	Rover reviewed logs documenting past contacts made with the stakeholders which pre-date the March 30, 2015 deadline. Rover evaluated the potential for a reroute to satisfy stakeholder's request. If the route was relocated, the project footprint would either be placed on an extreme side slope or closer to existing residences.
Burgettstown Lateral								

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter / Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
4/30/2015	Carisa Schramm - WCM Properties, LLC	Burgettstown, PA	20150430-5261	Miscommunication regarding survey permissions. Received a letter from Rover stating being sued by Rover Pipeline due to denied access to their property. Rover is forcing us into a legal battle over survey permission that we did indeed grant and would have again granted for second survey had they communicated with us. The lawsuit will and already has cost us time and money. They have not considered staying north where the line crosses State Rt.18 near Winkler Lane and Route the line through Hillman State Park for another mile or so then cross Steubenville Pike near Haul Road to avoid being so close to homes and business. Hillman State Park is roughly 4,000 acres that was strip-mined for coal in the 1960's and 1970's and in my opinion would not be impacted any more than the privately owned land currently being surveyed for the pipeline. The state park is for the most part undeveloped and used as state game lands with very little improvements that I'm aware of. The cultivation and re seeding resulting from the pipeline could actually improve this park land. Routing through the park would keep the pipeline further away from 11 or more homes and several businesses. We are asking for FERC to take this optional route into consideration.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	WCM Properties, LLC, 1310 Steubenville Pike, Burgettstown, PA 15021, Parcel # 340-033-00-00-0007-00. Rover has connected with the landowner and was granted survey permission. Hillman State Park is managed for hunting by the Pennsylvania Game Commission. In addition to hunting, it offers hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding. The mostly undeveloped land is comprised of open fields and mixed hardwood forests. A route through Hillman State Park would result in greater environmental impacts to wetlands, hardwood forests, and wildlife.
3/31/2015	Lawrence E. Bolind, Jr., Trustee	Imperial, PA	20150331-5069	Trustee of Old Wilson Farm and Aunt Clara Creek Land trusts, moves for leave to intervene so as to obtain legal status as a party to the application proceedings. Intervener's interest is that the proposed pipeline will cross over the Trusts' land, thereby affecting legal rights and interests in the Trusts' real property.	CP15-93-000 PF14-14-000 CP15-94-000 CP15-96-000	Landowner	PA-WA-HL-020.000	No site specific comments; No response required.
Mainlines								
3/30/2015	Dave J Baumberger	Mansfield, OH	20150330-5210	Motion to intervene.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	OH-RI-002.000 OH-RI-003.000	No site specific comments; No response required. OH-RI-003.000 is now offline.
4/1/2015	Marijan E. Grogoga	Mansfield, OH	20150401-5042	Motion to Intervene. Rover Pipeline is drawn to enter my property (Morton Farm). Concerns regarding a grove of 100 year old hickory trees being mostly removed. These trees may be a roosting site for the federally endangered species of Indiana brown bat. The route has been staked on farm/estate and I believe it could be engineered to pass the grove of hickories and turned to the east 100 ft. to 150 ft. in order to preserve trees and biodiversity of farm, or temporary right-of-way could be reduced to minimize destruction of trees. My farm is currently farmed using organic principles and the crop produced is native grass hay. The crop that is produced is of an exceptional composition and the techniques used allow the crop to be eligible for organic certification. Seeds of grass and hay not planted, but were developed using techniques described by Joel Salatin. Concerned that the topsoil and seed composition, once removed for the pipeline cannot be replaced or restored. It took 16 years to produce this exceptional crop. Route would also require removal of a 100-150 year old oak tree, could be engineered to go around it. Pipeline construction should be conducted with goal of preserving the natural environment and causing as little damage as possible.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-RI-008.000	Construction, right-of-way, and environmental consultants have reviewed the property and tried to route the pipeline to minimize the landowner concerns and Rover will continue to coordinate with the landowner. Environmental impacts (animals, vegetation, wetlands, and watersheds) are addressed in RR2 and RR3. Bat consultations and surveys are addressed in RR3. Compensation for loss of property or crops is addressed in RR5 and RR8. The Ag. Impact Mitigation Plan addresses crossing of agricultural lands as well as topsoil replacement to minimize impacts.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
4/10/2015	Mark A. Metzger	Shelby, OH	20150410-5040	Project crosses 3 of our farms and one that we cash rent and farm. We have many concerns with the project such as "open cut" of waterways (filed with FERC) on our property and neighbor's property. Rover told us they would bore under these. Field drainage tile drains to these waterways. If get rain during construction, could be detrimental to our crops and neighbor's crops if water can't drain in timely manner. Are they willing to pay for crop damages in our fields and neighbor's fields that pipeline not crossing? Pictures provided to show water flow during recent rains. Also concerned about drainage tiles in field that will be cut through. Some of their drain tile is 48" deep, same depth as minimum depth for pipe. What about future tile that may need to be installed? If 48" depth cover, only allows us to place the tile 24" deep. Concerned will devalue house and buildings within 150'-200' of proposed pipeline. Two of the farms will be divided by the proposed pipeline and neither one has a driveway into the other side of the field, will make very inconvenient to work these areas during construction. It will take years for land to make full recovery to produce yields it produces today, one-time payment unlikely to cover that. Won't see a direct benefit from the pipeline since we are on the Mainline section.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-RI-049.000 OH-RI-050.000 OH-RI-053.000	According to Rover's Procedures, stream flow will not be impeded during the installation of the pipeline. Other installation methods could be used such as flume crossings, pump and dam, and requirements that crossings be completed within 24 hours. Rover will install the pipeline with 24 inches of separation between existing drain tiles. Please refer to Rover FAQ sheet regarding property values and resale value. Rover is coordinating with the landowner to minimize impacts to farming operations during construction. Tests will be performed for compaction on subsoil and topsoil to ensure conditions are comparable to adjacent pipeline right-of-way. Rover's one time compensation is for damage spread out over 5 years and includes: 100% the first year, 100% the second year, 100% the third year, 30% the fourth year and 10% the fifth year. Gas will be carried through the pipeline to the Defiance, Ohio area where it is interconnected with ANR Pipeline and Panhandle Eastern Pipeline. From that point, it may be carried to local distribution companies throughout the region. Construction procedures across waterbodies are addressed in RR2 and the Rover Procedures. Compensation for crop damages is addressed in RR5. The Ag. Impact Mitigation Plan addresses crossing of agricultural land and drain tiles. Property values are addressed in RR5.
4/10/2015	Mark & Stephanie Metzger	Shelby, OH	20150410-5005	I have seen articles that say the proposed Nexus pipeline (PF15-10) location may be moved to the same corridor as the Rover lines. I really hope this does not happen. We are directly affected by the Rover lines on 4 different farms we either own, rent, or are involved with. We don't want 2-42" lines let alone 3! We make a living off of this land and it will take years for the land to recover.	PF15-10-000 CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-RI-049.000 OH-RI-050.000 OH-RI-053.000	Rover is not affiliated with the NEXUS pipeline project. All construction and restoration on the Rover Pipeline Project will be done in accordance with Rover's Plan and Procedures and other mitigation plans such as the Ag. Impact Mitigation Plan for crossing of agricultural land.
4/16/2015	Sherry L. Miller	Sherrodsville, Ohio	20150416-0006	These two 42" natural gas lines are proposed to route through our property and within 100' of our home. We live on 6 1/2 acres in rural area of Ohio. We bought our land 3 years ago and built our home and everything on our property and it is all being threatened by pipelines. Concerns about safety and destruction to property, environment, and the redwood trees planted several years ago. They will plow through the fragile wetlands in our area. Upset over use of eminent domain. Forwarded correspondence from the White House.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-CA-016.000	Construction, right-of-way, and environmental consultants have been conducting surveys in order to finalize a route which minimizes impacts to landowners and natural resources. Surveys and compensation are addressed in RR8. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR10. Environmental impacts (animals, vegetation, wetlands, and watersheds) are addressed in RR2 and RR3. Eminent domain is addressed in RR8.
4/22/2015	David and Judy Jones	Mineral City, OH	20150422-5069	We object to Rover crossing our 1.17 acre property. It is a hazard being so close to our home and we would have to move a 10x16 shed that is covering our water well. The work area would cut into the corner of our home. We have lived here for 25 years and have poured all of our money and hearts into this place. We absolutely don't want to move. They offered to buy us out but we could not replace what we have. Most of money would go for taxes. We are too old to tackle such a project; it's our piece of heaven on earth.	CP15-93-000	Landowner (Offline Now)	OH-TU-024.000	Landowner Mailing list shows to be offline now (Feb. filing).

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
4/23/2015	Joe Lawless	Perrysburg, OH	20150423-5216	As a Perrysburg businessman and a board member of the Perrysburg Chamber of Commerce, I write to you to express my support for the Rover Project. After careful consideration, I have concluded that this massive infrastructure investment will be good for our state, our region, and our country. We have around 500 apartments that we supply gas and other utilities to. We need to be sure that an affordable supply is always available. I urge your body to consider the wide ranging benefits this pipeline would have for our region and our state.	CP15-93-000	Offline	--	No site specific comment; No response required.
4/27/2015	Sheila Bittinger	Cadiz, OH	20150427-5247	I do not want the pipeline on my property what so ever. From day one we were threatened with eminent domain. They want to take 1/2 of my property that I will no longer be able to do anything with but will still have to pay taxes on. We have already suffered property damage by an ET Rover employee, as a result of their malice, which they deny. Bought property in 1989 and have planted over 1500 trees and now they want to destroy what we have worked hard to create. Also operate a business off of this property and hire local high school graduates. Our road is pretty much destroyed due to lack of repairs. We fish and hike and live and work and maintain our property. We have hand prints in the concrete and growth charts on the kitchen wall, we don't want to move. Please don't give Rover the right of eminent domain.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-HR-009.000	Rover is seeking a 3.147 acre permanent easement out of the Bittinger's 124 acre tract. Most of the 3.147 acres is currently in pasture. Following construction of the pipeline, the area would be returned to pasture. Rover believes Ms. Bittinger is referencing a route study at the beginning of the project. A surveyor in a pickup truck turned around on a public road and the rear tires got off of the road and made ruts within the public road right-of-way. After receiving a complaint from Ms. Bittinger, Rover attempted to pay for damages and apologized, but Ms. Bittinger refused the compensation.
4/28/2015	Laurie White	Canton, OH	20150428-5362	Please put a stop to eminent domain. My family and I don't want ET Rover or any of their affiliate companies coming on property. My family has already experienced problems created by Rover coming on property and tearing up land. ET Rover has continually threatened my family with eminent domain.	CP15-93-000	--	--	Commenter did not provide an address for follow-up. Rover was unable to definitively identify property in question in referencing the landowner's mailing list. Eminent domain is addressed in RR8. Compensation for any damages that may occur is addressed in RR8
Market Segment								
4/1/2015	Richard Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150401-0007	Concerns regarding: Distance of pipeline closer than 50 ft. to some houses, conflicts with Rover literature & within High Consequence Area. Why isn't spacing of automatic shutoff valves already known and disclosed will be based on safety or cost? Concerned about drilling across pristine historical river and under a 2 acre wetland, and then down a tree-lined road and beyond for another 700 ft. before terminating. Maximum allowable deflection of 7% in the pipe will restrict pulling of pipe and lubricant slurry levels. Lack of control over storage and disposal of drilling tailings, drilling lubricant, and bentonite lubricant slurry, since will be contractor's responsibility. Bentonite is impervious to water penetration and potential or discharge into river or wetland is unacceptable. Property is a terminal point of a glacial moraine and large boulders both on the surface and in the ground that can compromise drilling path. Rover hasn't responded to question regarding decision maker for alternate drilling route. No assurance that pipeline will remain carrying only natural gas and not be used for another product, revealing piping material specs should be required. Facts misrepresented regarding proposed alternate route following power line easement - complaints of expansion of sewage treatment plant and a contaminated property. Review of past DEQ results doesn't indicate contamination.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Crossing of wetlands and waterbodies are addressed in RR2. A Horizontal Direction Drill Contingency Plan was prepared for the project and addresses procedures and steps in the event of an inadvertent release of drilling mud during horizontal directional drilling beneath wetlands and waterbodies. Future plans and abandonment are addressed in RR1. Rover proposed a reroute in the February submittal to move away from ITC in this area to avoid a contaminated site and the expansion of a public water treatment facility. From discussions with the water treatment facility, an HDD of the facility is not recommended and is against Rover policies regarding construction within or near contaminated soils. Regarding proposed Pinckney Reroute (Market Segment MP 83.9 to 86.8).

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter / Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
4/27/2015	Richard Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150427-0414	Requests that FERC give further review to proposed route going through SE Michigan. Rover continues to make minor adjustments to a faulty route. The "new" connection terminal to an existing Vector line has provided opportunity to explore a better route that doesn't encounter high density residential areas, camping/recreational areas, or lake front property. Presented alternate route that encompasses mostly open land and mitigates endangerment to citizens & environment. It also has a shorter distance. Going north from Defiance, OH; enter Michigan west of US 127 near Waldron: Continue north, go east of the hills at Hoxie, west of Addison, and west of Farewell Lake near Jackson; then north to the terminal with the existing Vector line near Berryville. Drawing attached. Concerned with potential dangers to 3rd & 4th generation families living adjacent to an incendiary bomb. Fiduciary responsibility of FERC to insure actions of Rover don't infringe upon public and private safety.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	The proposed reroute would also affect many small townships, as well as contiguous forested wetlands associated with the Pittsford State Game Area, Jackson County Park, and the area west of the City of Jackson. In addition, the proposed route would not meet the Project's commercial obligations. The proposed interconnects with Consumers and Vector has been located to maximize hydraulic efficiency in the systems, and support seasonal fluctuations for local distribution to customers of Consumers. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11.
4/13/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150413-5138	We have read the FERCs Environmental Information Requests dated 4/02/2015 and share FERC's concern regarding Oak Wilt Virus and have previously commented on this issue. FERCs question in RR 3, item 7, raises the concern that FERC and Rover may not completely understand the nature of Oak Wilt Virus or how it is transmitted. This disease is currently causing huge problems in Michigan. Item 8 in RR3 seems to be regarding an Ohio plan only. FERC and Rover must understand that the best way to prevent transmission is to avoid woodlands. Any route passing through wooded habitat is gambling with danger. Open areas should be used when possible.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Precautions for oak wilt will be taken across the pipeline route. Rover intends to promptly burn or chip the wood resulting from all clearing activities, which is in accordance with the recommendations of the USDA Forest Service and the Michigan State University Extension.
4/16/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150416-5104	Contained within Rovers application is carefully crafted, ambiguous language describing a project that, if approved, would result in a conduit to transport gas, at shipper's discretion, away from and or through Michigan. If this application is approved as submitted it is entirely possible that none of the gas transported by the project will actually be distributed for consumption within Michigan. In light of this there is absolutely no need for a greenfield pipeline project traversing the Michigan Market Segment of this project. Stakeholders are aware of FERC's request for Rover to evaluate incorporating the Panhandle Eastern system and or its existing easement corridor as an alternative for the Michigan Market Segment. We strongly support this perfectly viable alternative.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Please refer to Resource Report 1, Purpose and Need, and the responses to the FERC April 2, 2015 Request for Additional Data, RR10, Response 1. Rover will be adjacent to the Panhandle Eastern system to the extent practicable.
4/23/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150423-5044	We would like to comment on Rover's response to FERC Environmental Information Request filed April 22, 2015 Resource Report 10-Alternatives Item 1. The FERCs request of Rover to provide a discussion on the type and extent of modification that would be required to the Panhandle system to accommodate the entire portion of the natural gas that the Rover Project would transport through the Market Segment into Michigan was clear and concise. There is no discussion of required modifications. Rover instead attempts to emphasize contractual requirements. We also request that FERC require Rover to include in their discussion any required modifications that would establish an interconnect between Panhandle and Vector.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	The April 22, 2015 Response to FERC's Request for Additional Information states that deliveries on Panhandle in accordance with Rover's current contracts would require a new 42-inch pipeline between the proposed Defiance Compressor Station and the existing Vector Pipeline. A modification to the existing system would not adequately compensate for the proposed Rover Pipeline. Rover will be adjacent to the Panhandle Eastern system to the extent practicable.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter / Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
4/28/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150428-5010	Regarding Rovers responses to Landowner Requests for Route Variations contained within Rovers response to FERC environmental Information Request Filed April 22, 2015 TABLE 10.6-3 Tract 043.000. No one from this trust has ever requested anything from Rover Pipeline, LLC except that they stay off our land and compensate us for the damage they caused when they did enter without proper notice or permission. To suggest that we simply asked them to move from a prime hunting location is not representative of the discussions we have engaged with Rovers land agents. The nearest county drain is more than a mile away from our land. The reference to MP 54.6 Map MI-LI 006.520 does not pertain to our tract.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Mr. Littlefield is correct regarding the incorrect entry on Table 10.6-3. Rover is approximately 200-240 ft. north of a stream, not a county drain. Rover has been granted survey access for this tract.
5/4/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150504-5081	Rover submitted a cursory evaluation of the Panhandle Route Alternative and proposes that it be eliminated from further consideration yet claims to be considering this same alternative in response to landowner concerns filed in the same resource report. How are stakeholders to believe that a sincere effort is being made to truthfully evaluate alternatives? It is clear that Rover has a preferred route and is not interested in considering anything else.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	The Panhandle Route has been addressed in both the February and April 2015 submittals. The Panhandle pipeline system does not have facilities or access to the Project Supply (Marcellus/Utica); region; therefore, it cannot provide takeaway capacity to transport natural gas supplies in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. While it could move a portion of the 1.3 Bcf/d that will be transported by the Market Segment into Michigan, the Panhandle system is currently at capacity in this segment. Therefore, it does not meet the Project objective. Deliveries on Panhandle in accordance with Rover's current contracts would require a new 42-inch pipeline between the proposed Defiance Compressor Station and the existing Vector Pipeline, which is currently proposed for this segment of the Rover Pipeline Project. Rover will be adjacent to the Panhandle Eastern system to the extent practicable.
5/5/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150505-5001	We have read the correspondence between FERC and the applicant regarding the Panhandle Route Alternative. As stakeholders, we feel Rover needs to provide a more detailed map and description of the route especially as it nears Brighton and continues onward to a proposed interconnect point with Vector. Of particular interest, is Rover's claim that the alternate route would require 9 miles of new right-of-way including crossing of the Brighton State Recreation Area. Stakeholders are entitled to more clarity regarding this alternate route. We are also requesting that FERC scrutinize the data presented in Table 10.6-12a, construction right-of-way widths are inconsistent with previously submitted information. Number of tracts crossed appears inaccurate. The applicant needs to clarify what footnote 1 means. Roads and railroads are not environmental concerns. It is our understanding that the proposed route would involve the Pinckney State Recreation Area yet this information has been omitted from the table.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Section 10.5.4.2, Planned Market Segment Route Alternatives, of Resource Report 10 identifies four "planned" route alternatives that would maximize use of existing rights-of-way along the Market Segment in Michigan. Resource Report 10, as filed with Rover's application in February 2015, included comparison Tables 10.5.13 through 10.5.16 (see Resource Report 10, Appendix 10B) with the appropriate data categories listed in FERC's Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation, as well as Figures 10.5-13 through 10.5-16 (see Resource Report 10, Appendix 10A) which depicts the planned route alternatives on USGS topographic maps. The footnote 1 of the April filing references the limited GIS data available for the tracts crossed. Comparisons were made based on publicly available GIS data. Rover will be adjacent to the Panhandle Eastern system to the extent practicable.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
5/11/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150511-5000	We feel it necessary to provide a landowner's perspective on Rover's analysis of the Panhandle Route Alternate. Using data that Rover submitted in their response to FERC's request regarding this alternative, it is clear that the Panhandle Route Alternate offers a significant environmental advantage. There would be 1,395 fewer individual tracts crossed minimizing the potential for eminent domain takings. It uses 166 more acres of agriculture/open land, impacts 34 less acres of forest and forested wetlands which take longer to recover than emergent wetlands. It has a 60% advantage regarding following existing easements and probably greater once the need for 9 miles of new right-of-way is analyzed further. Four fewer perennial streams are crossed. The Brighton State Recreation Area is not unique in that it consists of rolling woods and meadows interspersed with lakes, streams, and marshes. Most of the countryside in Michigan where this project is proposed has the same components whether it is public or private.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	The April 2015 response to FERC's comments, RR10, response 3, provides a comparison of the proposed route versus the Panhandle Route Alternate, which was not deemed to offer an environmental advantage over the proposed Market segment. Rover will be adjacent to the Panhandle Eastern system to the extent practicable.
4/23/2015	Sandy Pollock	Howell, MI	20150424-5150	I am the homeowner residing at 2793 Dutcher Rd., Howell, MI 48843. I will not agree or provide permission for Rover Pipeline to install a gas pipeline on my property. ITC owns the property directly behind my home and my property value dramatically decreased when the Madrid Station was expanded. A gas pipeline will decrease my property value as well. ITC owns a substantial amount of property behind the residential homes in my area. Please accept this comment as my formal written request that Rover Pipeline cannot trespass on my property to conduct any type of survey or installation of a gas pipeline. Any previous release to survey my property is hereby cancelled and revoked.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-076.521	Property values are addressed in RR5. Rover plans to be adjacent to ITC to the extent practicable, and is evaluating alternatives to potentially move into the ITC corridor, pending ITC approval.
4/27/2015	Robert Lesz	Pinckney, MI	20150427-5002	I live at 2156 Tiplady and wanted to make my voice heard. My family and I are 100% opposed to the installation of the ET Rover pipeline for many reasons. Moved to area to enjoy rural nature of the area, I don't want to move anywhere else. This pipeline poses a threat to everything that value in our area and benefits no one in Michigan. No one will be able to move from propane to natural gas. Concerns with environmental impacts, eminent domain, noise impacts regards to building, decreased property values and local economy, operation, and maintenance.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-067.210	Benefits are addressed in RR1. Environmental impacts are addressed in RR2 and RR3. Eminent domain is addressed in RR8. Property values and economic impacts are addressed in RR5. Noise impacts during construction are addressed in RR9. Operation and maintenance of the pipeline and facilities are addressed in RR1.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
5/13/2015	Gregg Hardy	Tipton, MI	20150513-5205	Concerned about the Rover route through area. As most in the area, we are an agricultural production business. Family has been farming this location since the early 1800's. Business has become much more complex when compare operational procedure from procedures 10 years ago. More procedures that require sub-surface construction, grid drainage tiling, underground irrigation transmission lines, green energy transmission lines back to the grid, and underground waste transmission lines. In addition, we anticipate the need for more underground technology in the future. Having a major gas line crossing our property in 5-6 locations will have a very serious impact on our operation and will have far reaching negative implications. The present proposed route will render these entire farms obsolete for modern farming practices because the proposed route cuts right through the middle of our property. We now do sub-soil tillage approximately every other year to fracture the subsoil "hard pan". We have a deep tillage tool that digs 36" below the surface. This process can pose a serious safety issue to my operator when working soil over installed pipeline. Have made 3 proposals that have been rejected by Rover. Proposes pipeline be located within or adjacent to existing right-of-ways. Enclosed map of proposed alternate route within existing easement along Highway M-52 and the Norfolk Southern easement along with a short area of a Consumer's Energy Transmission line easement.	CP15-93-000 CP15-94-000 PF14-14-000	Abutter Abutter Abutter Landowner Landowner	MI-LE-112.300 MI-LE-112.350 MI-LE-122.310 MI-LE-111.000 MI-LE-117.000	The proposed route is not feasible due to the increased safety risk of paralleling an existing railroad and state highway. In addition, it would impact the Township of Madison and pass through several congested areas within the City of Adrian and along the state highway north of Adrian. In accordance with the Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plan, Rover will coordinate with the landowner regarding deep tillage operations.
5/13/2015	Frank Zaski	Franklin, MI	20150513-5007	Rover still has not justified a need for their pipeline, especially north of Defiance. Using FERC's criteria, there is no "Public Convenience and Necessity" not met by at least four existing pipelines and Nexus. Michigan has the largest gas storage capacity in the US which negates any peak demand backup need, plus, reliable sources predict demand for gas in the Midwest and LNG export will be far less than Rover hopes for. Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) counts storage as another form of pipeline capacity. Michigan has the largest natural gas storage in the US and its gas storage capacity is 30% to 40% greater than total annual usage. In northern Ohio, Rover can connect with Panhandle Eastern which already serves Michigan and Vector. Rover could partner with ANR from northern Ohio to serve Chicago or connect to Vector in Marshall or Bridgeman, Michigan. Crossroads (interstate) has sufficient capacity on average. Crossroads has up to 150,000 Dth/d extra capacity in the winter and over 300,000 Dth/d extra capacity in the summer period. Or partner with Rocky Express (REX) for service to Michigan, the Midwest and the Gulf.	PF14-14-000 CP15-93-000	Other	--	Purpose and need are addressed in RR1. Route alternatives are addressed in RR10 of previous Rover submittals.
5/18/2015	Clifford Rowley	Pinckney, MI	20150518-5031	I live on Patterson Lake Road in Putnam Township of Livingston County, Michigan. The proposed Alternative Route 2 of the ET Rover pipeline would pass about 40 yards behind my property. I have the following very serious concerns about this pipeline: Impacts to preserved woodlands, public safety in Pinckney Recreation Area, highly populated areas, and a lack of necessity. There is a far less risky potential western route through the agricultural rural areas of Hillsdale and Jackson counties, resulting in a shorter distance to connect the proposed ET Rover pipeline to the Vector pipeline.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	Impacts on vegetation and wildlife are addressed in RR3. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Purpose and need are addressed in RR1. Route alternatives are addressed in RR10.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
5/18/2015	Sharon and Alan Fendt	Dexter, MI	20150518-5199	We ask FERC to take in to consideration the validity of the summary comments they have submitted. In reference to our property they are incorrect in saying they cannot move the pipeline to the western side of our property as they originally stated in their first map of the proposed pipeline to us. Our property is 78 acres. This property has no county drains on it, only the drains installed by previous owner (farmer) installed over 60 years ago so he could farm the low land that is wet most of the year. We are not farmers and those ditches are no longer used for that purpose. Property experiences severe flooding and concerned that won't be able to return to pre-existing conditions and could cause barn to flood because it sits not too far above the low lands. To move the pipeline west will not have such an impact on our property. The water table is higher here and our well is not that deep. The new route goes through the only buildable property we have without changing the exterior of the land and restructuring due to most of it being wet most of the year. Last Rover response is incorrect; our whole piece of property is a wet area and is drainage for neighboring parcels. What they wrote about the adjacent piece of property MI-WA-111.530 is also incorrect they have no creeks or drainage on their property the Creek runs all the way around our property. Project will devalue property and will not benefit us.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-111.540 MI-WA-113.360	The initial route filed with FERC had not yet been surveyed and the route was revised in the field during surveys. The property has drainage features which were considered to be natural features during surveys and avoided. Ponds on the western side of the property were also avoided. The pipeline will be buried and the property will be returned to preconstruction contours, so the pipeline will not have an effect on drainage. Property values are addressed in RR 5.
5/19/2015	Ronald Kardos and Marjorie Brigham-Kardos	Fenton, MI	20150519-5056	The issuance of a permit for ET Rover to build a pipeline should meet the requirement for a Public Need and Convenience, this requirement has not been met. There are at least 4 other pipelines that could be used to transport the product to Canada, the pipeline will not serve the public, Michigan has the largest gas storage facilities in the U.S. so no need to enhance peak demand backup, these reasons along with a multitude of negative environmental impacts and the damage to the soil along the entire route should be sufficient for FERC to deny a permit to ET Rover.	PF14-14-000, CP15-93-000	Offline	--	No longer affected (see Section 10.4.1, Vector System Alternative). Purpose and need are documented in RR1. Environmental impacts are addressed in RR1, RR2, RR3, RR6, RR7, and RR9. Soils are addressed in RR7.
5/27/2015	Karen Jones	Pinckney, MI	20150528-5002	ET Rover is proposing a pipeline 50 ft. from my property line and 100 ft. from my home. I have two young children at home and have done research. The pipeline is going to be 42" wide and they are going to run a psi at 1480 which means the blast zone will be 1200 to 1600 ft. My house would be totally disintegrated with me and my children in it. Requesting that application be denied, if not, I'm going to be forced to sell my home that we have built ourselves and invested money in over the last 10 years.	PF14-14-000	Abutter	MI-WA-117.245	Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11.
6/04/2014	Township of Putnam	Putnam, MI	20150604-5153	The Township opposes the proposed route of the Rover pipeline: the route does not adequately follow existing utility easements or other rights of way. May present public safety, environmental, and property value concerns for the Township and its residents, the pipeline will run in close proximity to high density residential areas and private and public camping and recreational grounds. Proposed route places pipeline within 90 ft. of residential homes and possibly within 70 ft. of at least one home on Tiplady Road. The Township understands that if a 42" pipeline fails, the radius of destruction is 1,200 ft. Should be placed in areas with ample open space. Rover has expressed concerns about pollution near the ITC easement; the Township understands this is at least 100 to 200 ft. way from the easement. The Township authorizes its legal counsel to continue to monitor FERC proceedings and to file any pleadings, motions, or documents, including this Resolution, necessary to advance the Township's position.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	To the extent practicable, the Project pipelines will be constructed parallel and adjacent to other existing pipelines or utility lines, or in remote areas, on primarily agricultural land, to reduce the potential interaction between the proposed pipeline and the public. The Project was revised in January 2015 during Pre-Filing to terminate at a connection with Vector Pipeline L.P. (Vector) in Livingston, County, Michigan in order to maximize use of existing infrastructure and minimize impacts to the environment and landowners. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11.
Other								

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
3/24/2014	Independent Oil & Gas Association of West Virginia, Inc.	--	20150324-5060	IOGA's intervention in this proceeding is necessary to protect its members' interest in the transportation of natural gas on Panhandle's system. As shippers, potential shippers and suppliers of gas on Panhandle, IOGA's members have a direct and substantial interest in the Panhandle Backhaul Project which would provide 750,000 dth per day of east-to-west firm transportation service within Panhandle's Market Zone to meet new demand for east-to-west transportation of production from the Marcellus and Utica shale regions to the Midwest and Gulf Coast markets. Accordingly, IOGA's intervention with full rights as a party is in the public interest.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/25/2014	DTE Gas Company	--	20150325-5263	Motion to intervene. DTE is a firm transportation customer on the Panhandle system. DTE's interests and those of its customers may therefore be affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Moreover, these interests are not adequately represented by any other party. Accordingly, DTE respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene herein with full rights of a party.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/26/2014	Chevron U.S.A. Inc	--	20150326-5079	Motion to intervene. Chevron is a producer and marketer of natural gas. Included in such volumes is natural gas that may be transported by Panhandle. Therefore, Chevron has a direct and substantial interest in the subject filing that may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. No other party can adequately represent Chevron's interests. Accordingly, its intervention will be in the public interest and is in accordance with Commission regulations.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/26/2014	FirstEnergy Service Company	--	20150326-5075	Motion to intervene. FirstEnergy has significant existing electric transmission and distribution lines, substations and associated infrastructure that may be impacted by the Rover Pipeline and the proposed interconnection. Therefore, FirstEnergy has an interest in this proceeding that cannot adequately be represented by any other party, and the Commission should grant this motion to intervene.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/27/2015	EQT Energy, LLC	--	20150327-5046	Motion to intervene. EQT Energy is an active participant in the transportation market holding capacity on numerous pipelines in the Appalachian region. In addition, EQT Energy has executed a precedent agreement with Rover Pipeline LLC ("Rover") for firm transportation capacity as part of the project proposed by Rover in Docket No. CP15-93-000. As one of the shippers seeking capacity through the Rover Project, with the potential to transport natural gas on Panhandle's system, EQT Energy respectfully represents that it has a substantial interest that will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding and that it cannot be adequately represented by any other party in this proceeding. EQT Energy's intervention is therefore proper and should be permitted, and its participation is in the public interest.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2015	Dave J Baumberger	--	20150330-5210	Motion to intervene.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	OH-RI-002.000	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2015	Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc	--	20150330-5379, 20150330-5380	Motion to intervene. COH has an interest that may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. That interest cannot be adequately represented by any other party.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2015	ConocoPhillips Company	--	20150330-5111 20150330-5123	Permission not granted to access document. Filed as privileged.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
3/30/2015	ConocoPhillips Company	--	20150330-5483	ConocoPhillips request that if, the Commission issues a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, the Commission condition any rolled-in rate determination on the absence of a significant change in circumstances when Panhandle seeks rolled-in rate treatment in any future rate proceeding. ConocoPhillips also requests that the Commission require Panhandle to account for construction and operating costs and revenues associated with the proposed project, consistent with Section 154.309 of the Commission's regulations.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2015	ConocoPhillips Company	--	20150330-5125	Therefore, ConocoPhillips has a direct and substantial interest in the subject filing that may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. No other party can adequately represent ConocoPhillips' interests.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2014	Exelon Corporation	--	20150330-5032, 20150330-5033	Motion to intervene. Exelon has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding, and its interests cannot be represented adequately by any other party.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2014	Vector Pipeline	--	20150330-5127, 20150330-5182, 20150330-5219, 20150330-5185	Motion to intervene. Vector has entered into a long-term, negotiated rate firm contract with Rover Pipeline LLC for existing, available capacity from a new interconnect in Livingston County, Michigan to the International Border. Under these circumstances, Vector has a substantial interest in, and will be directly affected by, the outcome of this proceeding. No other entity can adequately represent the interests of Vector in this proceeding.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
3/30/2014	Anadarko Energy Services	--	20150326-5084	Motion to intervene. AESC is a supplier, potential shipper, and/or potential agent for shippers of natural gas on Panhandle's system. Therefore, AESC has a direct and substantial interest in the subject filing that may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. No other party can adequately represent AESC's interests. Accordingly, its intervention will be in the public interest and is in accordance with Commission regulations.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
4/7/2015	Laclede Gas Company	--	20150407-5026	Motion to intervene. Laclede has contracts for firm transportation on Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, LP. Thus, Laclede has an interest in the outcome of this proceeding that cannot be represented or protected by any other party.	CP15-94-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
4/24/2015	James E Crouch	Middle Granville, NY	20150424-5133	Great paying jobs for our Union and will help meet energy demands with domestic energy.	PF14-14-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
5/1/2015	Cathy Johnson	Houston, TX	20150501-5003	Please do not grant eminent domain to Rover in this pipeline project. Rover should come up with another plan.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	General opposition to use of eminent domain.
5/4/2015	Shylo Carmody	Garfield Heights, OH	20150504-5014	Requests that FERC not grant eminent domain to Rover. People should have a choice and if they don't want it on their property, they should find another route. Parents should not be forced to give up property and still be required to pay taxes on it and have their property lose any potential future sale value.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	General opposition to use of eminent domain. Property values are addressed in RR5
5/15/2015	Jill McCartney	Caldwell, OH	20150515-5180	The Noble County Chamber of Commerce & Tourism Bureau fully endorses the Rover Natural Gas Pipeline project. We urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to give the Rover Pipeline application a timely review and grant permission for its construction to begin without delay.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.
5/28/2015	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Bloomington, MN	20150528-5206	Comments provided pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Recommends proposed developments avoid and minimize water quality impacts and impacts to high quality fish and wildlife habitat. Additional comments related to natural buffers around streams and wetlands, Corps of Engineers (COE) permits, best management practices, revegetation, invasive species, and the promotion of honey	CP15-93-000	Other	--	Rover is consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and other relevant agencies regarding potential project impacts.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
				bees and other pollinators such as the monarch butterfly. The Service has determined that two federally listed species are within range of the proposed project. These species are the endangered Indiana bat and the threatened northern long-eared bat. Surveys may be necessary if project site contains suitable habitat. The MBTA implements protection of all native migratory game and non-game birds with exceptions for the control of species that cause damage to agricultural or other interests. Tree clearing during the breeding season has potential for avian mortality and destruction of nests.				
6/01/2014	Allegheny Defense, Freshwater Account. Project, Heartwood, and Ohio Valley Environ. Coalition	--	20150601-5380	Commenters incorporate by reference the previous comments submitted for the Rover Pipeline, Panhandle Backhaul and Trunkline Backhaul Projects. Commenters reserve the right to provide further comments as more information is disclosed during these proceedings.	CP15-93-000 CP15-94-000 CP15-96-000	Other	--	No site specific comments; No response required.