



## **VOLUME IIB**

### ***ATTACHMENT 1C***

### ***FERC Summary of Comments***

**Summary of Comments Received: June 2, 2015 through June 26, 2015**

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
<b>Majorsville Lateral</b>								
6/22/2015	Henry Roth	Wheeling, WV	20150622-0017	I ask that you please give serious consideration to relocating the Rover Pipeline back to its original route (Exhibit 1) from its current route (Exhibit 2) with a slight modification (Exhibit 3) to make it FERC compliant for the following reasons: 1) Landowner knowledge of the area with support from the USEPA and Rover's own documentation (see Terracon report). Removing the timber on a 70% hillside would almost certainly result in a landslide contaminating the stream below and possibly rupturing the pipe. 2) The current route would mean clear cutting a 150 ft. wide stand of continuous mature oak timber which is unique to the area. The loss of habitat and food for wildlife would have a tremendous impact on the area. If the new route were implemented, it would mean running the pipe parallel on a 30% slope versus perpendicular on a 70% slope and the removal of sub-species timber instead of mature oak. This would be a safer and easier route with less impact on the area. This would be better for Rover and the landowner.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	WV-MA-ML-044.000 WV-MA-ML-046.000	Rover adjusted the line back onto Mr. Roth's tract after the survey team discovered a perennial stream and two ephemeral streams that are on a slope and present serious constructability and environmental issues according to FERC. Rover retained Terracon Consultants, Inc., who performed soil testing on June 22, 2015, as part of a site assessment for subsidence as Mr. Roth requested. Rover will analyze this data to evaluate the site for potential slippage and will submit it to FERC when available. Effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat are addressed in RR3. Rover will implement the Rover Plan and Procedures to minimize temporary and permanent effects on wildlife and to promote the rapid stabilization and revegetation of the disturbed areas.
<b>Burgettstown Lateral</b>								
6/15/2014	Robert & Brandon Webb	Burgettstown	20150615-0014	We are writing in regards to the Rover Pipeline that is proposed to run through our property in Carroll and Jefferson counties. My son and I are avid hunters and have always dreamed of owning our own property for hunting and a get-away for our families. We were finally able to make this dream come true and purchased 122 acres of beautiful hunting and farm property. We have slowly but surely worked to build a "home away from home" atmosphere. We have met with Craig Wurtzbacher regarding the current proposed route. This route will take out a tree line and unable us to build the pond on the property that we have been dreaming of. We have requested they move the line to run through the field where it would not impede our plans of putting in a pond. We would rather not have a pipeline running through our property at all.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	OH-CA-HL-001.000 OH-CA-HL-100.000	Mr. Robert Webb is open to the pipeline so long as it does not affect an area where a pond is being planned and if compensation can be agreed on. He would like for Rover to construct north of a tree stand which juts into the field. Reference has also been made to constructing south of their property in an area where strip mining has taken place. The right-of-way Field Manager has met with the Webbs twice on their property to discuss their concerns and see if Rover can mitigate the impact of the pipeline. Survey and construction are evaluating the Webb's preferred route.
<b>Seneca Lateral</b>								
6/02/2015	Glenn & Kathie Darrah	Woodsfield, OH	20150602-0156	Only as recent as April 30, 2015, we were advised by a land agent as to the proposed pipeline route through our property in Switzerland Township, Monroe County, Ohio. We feel the pipeline is too close (374 ft.) to the dwelling on our property. Concerned about safety of the occupants. Proposed pipeline goes through premium property and potential building sites. Monroe County is made up of rolling hills and much of the farm land is hillside. Therefore, flat, level land is prime real estate. A 42-inch pipeline in the proposed route would devalue the property considering it is so close to the dwelling and it goes through potential building sites. Route as proposed goes through a carbon field which was put in place back in 1950's, the purpose of which is to prevent corrosion to pipelines which were installed nearby at that time. The proposed pipeline goes through an area which may be an Indian burial mound. We mentioned this to the land agent, who advised it, would be reported to the appropriate division of investigation. Goes through a section of forest that contains sugar maple trees which we have used for making maple syrup. The amount offered by Rover for grant of the right-of-way and damages is unsatisfactory considering the concerns as listed and considering the	PF14-14-000	Landowner	OH-MO-SCL-129.000	Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Property values are addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.7. Archaeological surveys confirmed there is no Indian burial ground on this property. Compensation is addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.10 and RR8, Section 8.2. A rock formation was identified on an adjacent property which is channeling the proposed route into this alignment. The Darrah's requested route would place the pipeline within 200 ft. of an adjacent residence and would traverse the centerline of two ephemeral streams for approximately 1,300 ft. These ephemeral streams merge together to form a large ravine. Pipeline placement within the ravine is not feasible due to constructability issues and increased environmental impacts. Additionally, the current proposed route is located on top of a ridge and moving the pipeline outside of the ridge onto severe terrain would also present constructability and operational issues. Rover is consulting with landowner regarding compensation.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/05/2015	Glenn & Kathie Darrah/Roger E. Darrah & Susan D. Darrah	Woodsfield, OH	20150605-0009	<p>property is in an extremely active corridor where rights-of-way easements have been purchased for at least \$1 per inch in diameter of pipe per foot plus damages and land has been sold for compressor stations and other facilities. In light of the foregoing and in the spirit of cooperation, we propose an alternate route through the property, a copy of which is attached. There are already pipelines through the property and the line could be placed nearer to the existing pipeline corridor. Also, we believe the alternative route will be shorter and less costly. We are also preparing a counter offer for ET Rover for the grant of the easement and damages to property and timber.</p> <p>The northern 20 acres of our farm lay north of an intermittent stream. A 1940's pipeline easement, pursuant to emergency national defense legislation, was granted and located just north of the stream. In approximately 2010, Rocky Express obtained another easement and installed a pipeline just north of the older easement. Both easements were installed upon ground classified as land Class VI by the "Soil Survey of Monroe County" published in 1974. The soils in Monroe County are identified as land Classes VI and VII. Fifteen (15) acres or 18% is made of land Class IV or better soils. Rover's proposed easement will disturb and encumber nearly 6 acres or 39% of our best ground. Additional concerns include the proposed path of the pipeline. One of our preferred easement routes would be parallel to and north of the two existing pipeline rights-of-way. Previous easements of approximately 150 ft. have removed most of the trees from the adjacent area. Also, this would be about 600 ft. less in length, would not cross carbon field or the 750kv power line, would avoid mature trees, and would be farther away from the farmstead, thus not bisecting the middle of our property. We are less than a mile from the terminus of the Seneca lateral near a major pipeline convergence station. In addition, the installation of numerous gathering lines combine to create increasing demand for rights-of-way.</p>	PF14-14-000	Landowner	OH-MO-SCL-129.000	Soils affected by the proposed project are addressed in RR7. Rover has developed an <i>Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plan</i> (AIM Plan) that will be implemented for agricultural lands in Ohio and Michigan. Restoration and reseeded of the construction work areas will be done in accordance with the Rover Plan, the Rover Procedures, and the AIM Plan, landowner agreements, as supplemented with recommendations from the local conservation authority. A rock formation was identified on an adjacent property which is channeling the proposed route into this alignment. Rover is consulting with landowner regarding routing and compensation.
6/25/2015	Carol Swoboda (for Angela Burkhart)	Jerusalem, OH	20150625-0015	<p>Please note that Angela C. Burkhart died in November 2014. The property I live on now will go to my 3 sons. 1) Howard F. Swoboda 2) Merle L. Swoboda 3) Daniel L. Swoboda, so please remove Angela's name and add the next in line. You can use the same address and I'll be sure to it that my son receives it.</p>	CP15-93-000	Abutter	SCL-ADJ-036	Rover will make the requested change in ownership to the mailing list. Please accept our condolences for your loss.
<b>Market Segment</b>								
6/03/2015	Keith R. Bennett	Manchester, MI	20150603-5162	While considering the permit for the Rover Pipeline, please take into consideration the lack of necessity of this pipeline. The utilities in our state have their NEXUS pipeline under your review. That would fulfill the need and not destroy a lot of beautiful land.	PF14-14-000	Abutter	MI-WA-038.200	Purpose and need are addressed in RR1.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/02/2015	Andrea Mast-Knopf,	Pinckney, MI	20150602-0040	Resolution approved by Putnam Township Board, approximately 160 residents are opposed to this pipeline and were in attendance at May 20, 2015 meeting. The Township opposes the proposed route for the following reasons: a) Proposed route does not adequately follow existing easements. b) May present public safety, environmental, and property value concerns because will run in close proximity to high density residential areas and private and public camping and recreational grounds. c) Pipeline within 90 ft. of residential homes and possibly within 70 ft. of at least one home on Tiplady. For a 42" pipeline, radius of destruction typically 1200 ft. d) Pipeline should be placed in areas with ample open space, with an "impact zone" or buffer to protect property in event of failure. e) Pollution near ITC easement is at least 100 to 200 ft. away from easement, which may allow Rover to place pipeline within easement.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Utilization of existing easements is addressed in RR10. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Water use and quality are addressed in RR2. Fisheries, vegetation, and wildlife are addressed in RR3. Property values are addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.7. RR8 addresses the Project's effect on public lands, special interest areas, recreational areas, transportation corridors, residential and commercial development, and visual resources. 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.
6/11/2015	David F. Blough	Dexter, MI	20150611-5161	Objects the proposed alternate route for the Rover Pipeline through Washtenaw County. The alternate route is not really using an existing easement, but creating a new easement by enlarging an existing easement. They would place the new pipeline only 10 ft. from the existing Panhandle pipeline. Residents have learned to live with the restrictions of having a large, high pressure gas line on one's property. Nearly everyone has respected the easement by not planting large trees or building structures on it. To permanently increase the easement by 50 ft. (100 ft. temporarily) is wrong. Those of us, who have planted beautiful trees, did extensive landscaping and built structures (including homes) which would all be destroyed by this alternate route, cannot help but feel that we have been lied to. I believe that, if the proposed pipeline cannot be placed in an existing easement, it should be placed in Rover's originally proposed route. That route appears to be nearly all open space and farm land with minimal (if any) damage to personal property. I believe that this route would be the safest, most direct, cause the least disruption to landowners and be the most environmentally sound option.	CP15-93-000	Abutter Landowner	MI-WA-094.314 MI-WA-093.510	The proposed Rover route utilizes the existing Panhandle Eastern Pipeline easement to the extent possible. Trees will need to be removed within right-of-way to allow for safe install of the pipe. The proposed temporary workspace has been trimmed to avoid homes and buildings on the property.
6/11/2015	Karl & Robin Klement	Pickney, MI	20150611-5051	This project is not needed for the state of Michigan; we currently have all the gas we need for years to come. The gas from this project will be sent to Canada for Canadian consumers to profit a Canadian company. A small portion may come back to the U.S. Why should we be subjected to hardship for another country's use? The route they have chosen goes through areas with a relatively high population density. If the route were moved to the west into farm country it would affect far fewer people and I would think many farmers would welcome the chance to earn some extra money.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	MI-LI-013.520	Purpose and need and the Project scope, including deliveries, are addressed in RR1. Route alternatives are discussed in RR10.
6/12/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150612-5242	We would like to comment on Rovers recently filed response to a letter we submitted to FERC on 5/4/15 (FERC ID# 20150504-5081). It seems that Rover is confused about the difference between a comment concerning the Panhandle Route Alternative vs. The Panhandle Eastern System Alternative. Only the last sentence in their response is relevant to our concern. Rover is misleading FERC and stakeholders by claiming construction will be adjacent to Panhandle Eastern to the extent practicable. This is simply not true. Rover is attempting to brush aside an alternative that would be in the public's best interest.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Rover has maximized the locations that can utilize existing rights-of-way, including Panhandle Eastern, based on civil, biological, and cultural surveys to date. As discussed in the comparison of the Market Segment and Panhandle Alternate Route in the April 22, 2015 filing, the Panhandle Route Alternate does not offer an environmental advantage over the proposed Market Segment. The June 2015 supplemental filing addresses additional Market Segment route variations incorporated into the proposed route.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/12/2015	Karl Klement	Pinckney, MI	20150612-5015	<p>We are aware that pipeline development companies, such as Energy Transfer Partners, grow their business primarily through greenfield construction projects. This practice has little to do with "necessary infrastructure" and creates a direct conflict with private landowners and environmentalists. We are again requesting that the applicant provide a meaningful study of the Panhandle Eastern Route Alternative.</p> <p>As a homeowner along the proposed E.T. Rover pipeline, I have an environmental concern about this project being able to proceed. I am very sensitive to continuous, loud, and/or high pitched noises, to the point of incapacitating migraines at times. It is for this reason I am worried about the changes to the noise and vibration levels around our home should this project be approved. After considering the situation, I have come up with this idea: 1. For each permanent residence on/within a quarter-mile of final route, they can choose to hire vibration and sound consultant (at E.T.'s expense) to provide sound and vibration testing of existing conditions. 2. E.T. will deposit in an escrow account for every homeowner that chose this option, a sum of 6 times the appraised value (at E.T.'s expense) of the property and home prior to construction. 3. Within a set period after flow begins, the same set of vibration and noise tests is to be performed (at E.T.'s expense). If the levels have increased, homeowner would be entitled to withdraw their portion of escrow (plus interest earned if applicable) as payment for pain/suffering. 4. If at the time, the homeowner chooses to move due to adverse conditions, E.T. will be responsible for all moving expenses. These costs will be in addition to those held in escrow. Also concerned with property value loss, increased homeowners, etc.</p>	CP15-93-000	Abutter	MI-LI-013.520	Noise and vibration levels are addressed in RR9. Additional information regarding vibration is submitted herein within the Environmental Information Request Document, under Response Number 9-5. Compensation is addressed in RR 8. Property values are addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.7.
6/06/2015	Richard J. Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150616-0019	<p>Provided a copy of a letter to Rover Pipeline responding to their insistence on our immediately agreeing to an easement on our property without their giving any information on how they intend to cross over 600' of a river and 2+ acres of wetland. The river is a major tributary to the Huron River and Chain of Lakes. An even greater worry is that nobody seems responsible for monitoring their actions during this phase of the project. They plan to install the pipeline within 90' of some family homes. The "incineration zone" for this pipeline is a 1200 ft. radius. They have drilled "test coring" within 100' of residential wells, but refused to disclose depth of coring, or type of material being poured in the holes from a Hazmat truck. In a letter dated April 20, 2015, I sent you an alternate "desk top plan" for this pipeline. If we were to provide an aerial photo survey of this route, would FERC be willing to require Rover to properly investigate and submit a response? Without FERC's input, Rover will fail to act. I would appreciate a response either way.</p>	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Rover intends to construct across the Portage River and the two wetlands on this property using a horizontal directional drill (HDD). Please refer to the Portage River HDD Plan filed June 10, 2015 under Volume II-B, Resource Report 1, Attachment 1A – Alignment & HDD Drawing Sets, Market Segment, Market HDDs. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Geotechnical field and laboratory services are being performed at proposed HDD crossings, including the Portage River crossing. The scope of work includes borings of varying depths depending on site conditions and depth of proposed HDD, visual classification and laboratory testing of representative soil and rock samples, groundwater sample lab results (if possible), and preparation of a geotechnical data report. Once the soil boring has been completed, the holes are grouted with a combination of sand, cement, and bentonite. The technique used to take the soil boring is the same that is used to drill water wells. A hazmat truck is necessary at the drills to carry cuttings away from the site for proper disposal, as required by law. No hazardous materials were transported to nor used during the soil boring collection process. . Boring logs which accompany the geotechnical data reports include soil descriptions, consistency evaluations, boring depths, sampling conditions, and any groundwater conditions. The geotechnical data report for the Portage River HDD is not complete, but will be filed with FERC upon completion and available to the public. Completed

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/09/2015	Tara Preston	Pickney, MI	20150609-5061	I am writing this email in the hopes that you are reading all correspondence from Livingston County and Putnam Township residents regarding the proposed ET Rover Pipeline that is coming through our community. The pipeline is proposed to come right through my yard and destroy a good portion of my 5-acre wooded parcel. My family and I are irrevocably opposed to this action. This is a very dangerous and scary thing happening in our community. We do not want this pipeline running through Putnam Township. We want this stopped.	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-022.510	geotechnical reports are enclosed in Volume IIB, Resource Report 6, Attachment 6C.  The proposed Rover Pipeline is abutting the east property boundary at this location. Moving further away from the house would encroach on a neighboring property and residence and would only transfer impacts. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11. Vegetation and wildlife impacts are addressed in RR3.
6/15/2015	Karl Klement	Pinckney, MI	20150615-5029	I have previously expressed the concern I have with this proposed pipeline creating vibrations due to its normal operation. Here is more information reinforcing my concern. Where I live we don't hear any constant droning. This is a grave environmental impact on our area and must be taken seriously by FERC. The conclusion to its effect should not be taken lightly. I suffer from extreme sensitivity to constant droning noise which is one reason I moved to the country to get away from "industry" noises in city life. Now Rover wants to subject me to this droning again? The solution is, to not let a foreign company install a pipeline on U.S. soil that benefits foreign citizens.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	MI-LI-013.520	Noise and vibration levels are addressed in RR9. Additional information regarding vibration is submitted herein within the Environmental Information Request Document, under Response Number 9-5. Compensation is addressed in RR 8. Property values are addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.7. Rover is an American company.
6/16/2015	David Daniel/Jeanne Littlefield Daniel Trust	Brownstown, MI	20150616-5183	Regarding Rover's June 15 supplement to its Feb. application, Resource Report 10-Alternatives: Rover continues in its attempt to preclude meaningful consideration of the Panhandle Eastern Route Alternative by submitting variations of the proposed route through the Michigan Market Segment of the project. Route variations, whether Rover designates them "Major" or "Minor", do not mask Rover's effort to press for its preferred route. As it is, Rover's supplemental application offers Michigan stakeholders and FERC no real alternative route to consider. Rover goes to great length providing details of possible collocation with short stretches of ITC easements but makes no mention of the Panhandle Eastern Route Alternative. The proposed route, including all suggested variations, would incorporate only 21 miles of existing easements that are coincidentally close to the preferred route. Of these 21 miles, Panhandle Eastern easements total only 6.5 miles. The Panhandle Eastern Route (from Defiance to the Vector interconnect) represents, by far, the best solution for stakeholders if FERC is going to require Michigan to absorb the impacts of this project. We are relying on FERC to provide a counterweight to the enormous pressure Rover is applying to private landowners affected by this process.	CP15-93-000	Landowner Abutter	MI-WA-043.000 MI-WA-044.200	Rover has maximized the locations that can utilize existing rights-of-way, including Panhandle Eastern, based on civil, biological, and cultural surveys to date. As discussed in the comparison of the Market Segment and Panhandle Alternate Route in the April 22, 2015 filing, the Panhandle Route Alternate does not offer an environmental advantage over the proposed Market Segment. The June 2015 supplemental filing addresses additional Market Segment route variations incorporated into the proposed route.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/18/2015	Karl Klement	Pinckney, MI	20150618-5029	Concerned about pipeline vibration. All pipes vibrate when a medium flows through them. We know that this vibration will be transmitted through the soil and in turn into buildings dropping off as you get farther away. The current route puts this within 100' of my home. I know my home will be shaking as a result. This greatly affects our quality of life. Our area has no industrial noise/vibrations and we enjoy the peace and calm of country life every day. That will change if this pipeline is approved. If FERC finds this pipeline is needed (which we all know it's for Canadian citizens) and decides to grant the permit, those owners living within a quarter mile radius of the line should be compensated greatly by ET Rover before they are allowed to commence work. Would you want your entire lifestyle changed from peace and quiet to industrial 24/7? Another harmful side effect this line will have due to vibration is killing of the bees of my bee farm. A lively hood I enjoy for extra money.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	MI-LI-013.520	Noise and vibration levels are addressed in RR9. Additional information regarding vibration is submitted herein within the Environmental Information Request Document, under Response Number 9-5. Compensation is addressed in RR 8. Property values are addressed in RR5, Section 5.2.7.
6/24/2015	Karl Klement	Pinckney, MI	20150624-5024	Recently I found out that FERC is funded by the same industry it claims to regulate. How is this not a conflict of interest? It is not possible that FERC would give an unbiased decision in regards to a pipeline when its very existence relies on that industry. I believe it's time for the courts to step in and weigh in on this matter and I for one will look into that possibility.	CP15-93-000	Abutter	MI-LI-013.520	No Project specific comment, no response required.
6/23/2015	Dea Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150623-0044	As a resident of Putnam Township since 1962, I find it unbelievable that the ET Rover Company has designed a 42" gas pipeline through Pinckney, MI. This proposed pipeline appears to be designed by someone who has never been to this area and hasn't a clue of all of the homes, commercial buildings, lakes, rivers, hiking/bicycle/horseback riding trails that will be affected. The area is classified as Pinckney Recreation area drawing thousands of people every year to our public swimming and camping areas and a host of other recreational activities. Pinckney, MI is a somewhat densely populated area with many subdivisions within 18 miles of Ann Arbor, Michigan which is home of the University of Michigan. West of this Metropolitan area is property that is not as densely populated as Pinckney, MI and would not have as disruptive of an impact. They will purchase homes in the pipeline right-of-way they need, but what about the homes within a 50 ft. radius? Going west through vacant land would also be more cost effective for the purchase of pipe.	CP15-93-000 CP15-94-000 CP15-96-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Detailed civil, biological, and cultural field surveys were conducted to determine the proposed route. Rover has minimized the impact to residential properties by locating the pipeline in areas removed from residential uses to the extent practicable and reducing workspace near residences where possible. Rover's land agents and contractors will coordinate with property owners before and throughout the construction process to minimize impact on landowners. For residences located within 50 ft. of construction work areas, Rover will implement the residential mitigation measures outlined in RR8, Section 8.1.3.4.
6/23/2015	Andrea Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150623-0040	Michigan is the land of the fresh water Great Lakes. Pristine rivers in Michigan provide fresh water to the Great Lakes. One of the environmentally healthy rivers that provide water to Lake Erie is the Portage River that flows within 25 ft. of our dining room window (enclosed pic) that works its way and drains into Lake Erie. Rover plans to put this 42", 1480 psi, gas line 300 ft. from our dining room window destroying 100 year old trees, natural habitat, and many species of wildlife. This 42" gas pipeline will incinerate everything within 1200 ft. radius when it leaks/explodes.	CP15-93-000 CP15-94-000 CP15-96-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Water use and water quality are addressed in RR2. A horizontal directional drill is proposed to cross the Portage River and two wetlands located on this property. To minimize impacts during construction and operation of the Project on water and wetland resources, Rover will implement the Rover Plan and Procedures to address site-specific conditions encountered along the pipelines. In addition, Rover will implement the measures contained in its SPR Procedures to minimize the risk of spills of hazardous materials during construction. Vegetation and wildlife impacts are addressed in RR3. Reliability and safety are addressed in RR11.

Date of Letter (FERC)	Commenter	Town, State	FERC ID Number	Comment	Docket No.	Landowner / Abutter/ Other	Tract No.	Comment/Response
6/23/2015	Richard J. Knopf	Pinckney, MI	20150623-0048	Enclosed is a recent pamphlet from FERC outlining their review process for environmental comments from citizens on the above project. Noticeably missing, except for one comment, is the negative impact on residents directly or secondarily involved with this installation. It appears that protection of the "environment" is more important to FERC than personal safety and uncertain psychological effect on those who will be living next to a potential bomb. There is no plausible reason to install this pipeline within 90 ft. of a residence when there are alternate routes in open farm fields. The pamphlet mentions that the next phase of the Review Process will be "Public Input Opportunity". Will this only involve environmental questions, or will those of us that have a greater issue be involved? Where and how are these meetings held?	CP15-93-000	Landowner	MI-LI-002.000	Detailed civil, biological, and cultural field surveys were conducted to determine the proposed route. Rover has minimized the impact to residential properties by locating the pipeline in areas removed from residential uses to the maximum extent practicable and reducing workspace near residences where possible. Public Input Opportunity meetings would be scheduled and coordinated by the FERC.
<b>Other</b>								
6/05/2014	Jeffrey Erb	Montpelier, OH	20150605-5095	Natural gas is an enormously versatile fuel that helps power our nation and enhances its energy security. But our oil and gas production has outpaced the infrastructure that transports the product. The proposed Rover Pipeline presents a huge opportunity to create thousands of jobs and boost the economy throughout the state. This \$4.3 billion dollar infrastructure investment project would directly affect the local, regional and national labor force by creating up to 6,500 temporary construction jobs. That's many new customers and their families who will buy gas and shop at our Main Stop Stores here in Northwest Ohio. In addition, an estimated \$153 million in tax revenue will be paid annually to federal, state and local entities that the pipeline crosses. This pipeline has huge potential to expand natural gas development right here in Ohio, strengthen our state's economy, and put our people to work.	CP15-93-000	Other	--	No site specific comment, no response required.