

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
Resource Report 1 – General Project Description		
1-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014, update table 1A-3 (appendix 1A) to report the distance from the Additional Temporary Work Spaces (ATWS) for each wetland or waterbody within 50 feet of an ATWS.	See Table 1A-3
1-2	General – Provide a table that clarifies the survey period and anticipated report completion date for the following items:	See Section 1.3.4, Table 1.3-7 (not 6)
	a. biologicals surveys;	See Section 1.3.4, Table 1.3-7
	b. cultural resources surveys;	See Section 1.3.4, Table 1.3-7
	c. geotechnical investigations; and	See Section 1.3.4, Table 1.3-7
	d. species-specific surveys (see comment RR3-1 below).	See Section 1.3.4, Table 1.3-7
1-3	General – Provide documentation of consultation with Columbia Gas Transmission, L.L.C. (Columbia) regarding its Leach XPress Project (PF14-23), as it appears that the rights-of-way for Columbia and Rover’s projects may parallel or overlap for roughly 25 miles. Additionally, provide the following:	See Section 1.3.1.2 and Table 1.3-2
	a. a table (by milepost) indicating where the rights-of-way may overlap, abut, or parallel each other (include all relevant spacing details);	See Table 1.3-2
	b. a discussion of how coordination of construction and restoration efforts would be coordinated should workspaces overlap; and	See Section 1.3.1.2
	c. any additional outreach efforts conducted by Rover in this area with stakeholders or agencies to avoid confusion between the projects.	See Section 1.3.1.2
1-4	Section 1.3 (page 1-4) – Update the section to include a discussion on the need for and purpose of the bi-directional flow metering and regulating stations along the Supply Laterals.	See Section 1.3.2.2
1-5	Section 1.3 (page 1-4) and Table 1.3-3 – Update the section to explicitly state the total number of meter stations that are planned for the Supply Laterals.	See Section 1.3 and Table 1.3-4
1-6	Section 1.3.2.2 and Table 1.3.3 (page 1-10) – Clarify the status of the Michigan Consolidated Delivery point and Meter Station in Shiawassee County, Michigan now that the line intercepts with Vector in Livingston County, Michigan.	See Section 1.3.2.2 and Table 1.3-4

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
1-7	Sections 1.3.2.3 and 1.3.2.5 (page 1-11) – Update the sections to provide additional details for the “Receiver Facilities” and “Launchers and Receivers” and clarify the differences between the two facilities.	See Sections 1.3.2.3 and 1.3.2.5
1-8	Sections 1.3.2.3 and 1.3.4 (pages 1-11 and 1-12) – Update the sections to reconcile the table numbers; currently the sections list two tables as 1.3-4.	All tables in Section 1.3 verified or renumbered.
1-9	Table 1.4-1 (page 1- 14) – Update the table, and associated text, as applicable, to reconcile the apparent omission of the Defiance Compressor Station under the aboveground facilities category for the Market Segment.	See Table 1.4-1
1-10	Table 1.5-1 (page 1-19) – Update the table to identify the locations within the Project Area where the 30-50 permanent workers would be employed. Also, reconcile the discrepancy in the number of permanent workers between this section and section 5.2.1.2 and table 10.3.1.	See Table 1.5-1 in Resource Report 1. See Section 5.2.2.2 and Table 5.2-1 in Resource Report 5. See Table 10.3-1 in Resource Report 10.
1-11	Figure 1.6-1 (page 1-23) – Update the figure with a legible image.	New Figure 1.6-1 added.
1-12	Section 1.6.1.1 (page 1-22) – Define in hours, days or weeks the installation timeframe between the first 42-inch-diameter pipe and the second 42-inch-diameter pipe stated as being “directly afterward.”	See Section 1.6.1.1
1-13	Section 1.6.1.5 (page 1-32) – Verify that Rover has and will continue to communicate with states, counties, municipalities, individuals/communities, etc. for in-road construction and appropriate pipe depth at public and private road crossings.	See Section 1.6.1.5
1-14	Section 1.11.1 (page 1-45) – Update this section to include specific information on each facility. Table 10.7-1 lists the “electrical requirements” for nine compressor stations with the minimum distances to power lines (between 0.5 to 3 miles). The connecting facilities would be considered non-jurisdictional.	See Section 1.11.1
1-15	Section 1.11.1 (page 1-45) – Update the section and table to include the Supply Header Project (PF15-5) and Atlantic Coast Pipeline Project (PF15-6) and include a discussion of the potential overlap of the projects’ routes in Doddridge County, West Virginia.	See Revised Table 1A-11 and Section 1.12
1-16	Section 1.12 (page 1-47) – For each of the identified major projects that would be crossed by Rover, provide a detailed analysis of the potential cumulative effects by resource within the identified region of influence for cumulative impacts (e.g. Hydrologic Unit Code watershed [HUC]). Provide labels on figure 1C-3.	This information was provided in Section 1.12.1 and is indicated in Figure 1C-3 in legend.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
1-17	Section 1.12.1 (page 1-48) – Identify the locations (by facility and milepost) of the small localized areas where construction would overlap and have common impacts.	See Section 1.12.1
1-18	Section 1.12.2 (page 1-49) – Provide the location (facility and milepost) and analysis of wetland impacts where major cumulative projects overlap with the HUC 12, particularly focusing on individual wetland systems (identify the specific feature adversely affected by cumulative projects).	See Section 1.12.2.
1-19	Section 12.3 (page 1-49) – Identify the localized area (facility and milepost) where the locations of these projects overlap. Provide an evaluation of the cumulative effects on vegetation and wildlife resources in these areas, and avoidance or minimization measures as necessary.	See Section 1.12.3
1-20	Section 1.12.4 (page 1-50) – Provide an analysis for “minor” and “major” projects relative to the pipelines and the aboveground facilities. Include a discussion of potential cumulative effects where projects may overlap the portions of the Project where cultural resources were found to be present.	See Section 1.12.4
1-21	Section 1.12.5 (page 1-50) – Provide the locations where socioeconomic cumulative effects are expected to be positive (i.e., where do the cumulative benefits of the multiple projects occur?).	See Section 1.12.5
1-22	Section 1.12.6 (page 1-51) – Identify the cumulative projects and describe those areas where cumulative effects may occur because multiple aboveground facilities are proposed in the same localized area. Provide avoidance and minimization measures as necessary. At a minimum, the gas processing plants should be described here.	See Section 1.12.6
1-23	Section 1.12.6 (page 1-51) – A conclusion should not be based on the relative size of the geographic area, but rather the scope of the Project and cumulative effects on land use and visual resources within 0.5 mile. Revise and provide further clarification of the conclusion.	See Section 1.12.6
1-24	Section 1.12.7 (page 1-51) – Section 1.12.6 states that multiple aboveground facilities are located in the same localized area. For each occurrence, evaluate the potential effects on air quality or noise standards with implementation of the identified cumulative projects.	See Section 1.12.7
1-25	Volume II, Appendix 1A (Supplemental Tables) – Update and file revised tables as indicated below:	See below.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	a. table 1A-1 (Adjacent Right-of-Way): update the Overlap field to report one value based on desired/anticipated overlap or minimum expected overlap (currently reports a range, i.e., 0-20 feet);	Table 1A-1 Revised heading to “Desired Overlap” and added footnote.
	b. table 1A-3 (ATWS): update to include footnote 2;	Footnote removed.
	c. table 1A-4 (Access Roads): update to reconcile land types reported as “TBD” or include a footnote explaining how these acreages are accounted for in acreages reported in various tables throughout the RRs; and	See Tables 8A-1 and 8A-2 footnotes. All road impacts are included in the Industrial / Commercial category.
	d. update table 1A-7 to identify the planned crossing method (i.e., a single method) for all roadways to be crossed by the Project, including private roads.	See Table 1A-7
1-26	Volume II, Appendix 1B (Rover’s Plan): Clarify the apparent typographical error on page 10, F.4, part h.	Complete.
1-27	Volume III, Attachment 1A (Plot Plans) – Update and file revised plans and associated information as indicated below:	See below.
	a. update the plot plans to depict the facility site at a closer scale with each facility component listed in table 1A-2 clearly depicted and labeled; and	Complete.
	b. verify the type of existing structures that would be moved (i.e., residential, shed, barn, etc.) and the details of the removal (i.e., purchased from landowner, to be relocated, etc.) at the Defiance Compressor Station location, and elsewhere as applicable.	See Table 8A-3 and Appendix 8B
Alignment Sheets		
1	General – The Sherwood Lateral alignment sheets depict two milepost (MP) 1 mile markers (one at MP 1 and another at what should be MP 2). Update Sherwood Lateral alignment sheets and corresponding tables to reference the appropriate mileposts.	Alignment sheets updated to reflect MPs 1A and 1B. Tables updated to include an A or B designation as appropriate.
2	General – Update the alignment sheets to ensure streams, creeks, and wetlands are consistently labeled or depicted.	Streams, creeks and wetlands are depicted by color/linetype and labeled on the alignment sheets.
3	General – Update the corresponding tables or alignment sheets to reconcile the following discrepancies.	See below.
	a. The following are inconsistencies between table 1A-1 and the alignment sheets:	See below.

FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
i. update all alignment sheets to include the specific Operator names for power lines, as listed in table 1A-1;	Table includes more specific and recent data than depicted in alignment sheets.
ii. Sherwood Lateral: the adjacent pipeline listed from MP 0.10 to 0.17 is not labeled or marked on the alignment sheet;	No survey data available on tract WV-DO-SHC-001.530 and WV-DO-SHC-001.000. Data included based on aerial interpretation.
iii. Sherwood Lateral: the Union Carbide Pipeline listed from MP 8.89 to 9.04 is labeled on the alignment sheet as Miss Utility of West Virginia Pipeline;	Updated table.
iv. Sherwood Lateral: the Consol Energy Pipeline listed from 14.28 to 14.47 is labeled as "Foreign Pipeline" on the alignment sheet;	Table includes more specific and recent data than depicted in alignment sheets.
v. Sherwood Lateral: the Consol Energy Pipeline adjacent to the Sherwood Lateral near MP 8.8 to 4.85 is not listed in the table;	Unable to identify location based on MP provided. There is no Consol Energy Pipeline on the alignment sheets at MP 8.8 or 4.85.
vi. Sherwood Lateral: the Foreign Pipeline near MP 28.9 to 28.95 adjacent to the Sherwood Lateral is not listed in the table;	Updated table.
vii. Sherwood Lateral: the Eureka Hunter Pipeline listed between MP 37.31 to 37.77 is also adjacent to the Sherwood Lateral between (approximately) MP 38.01 to 38.04, which is not listed in the table;	Updated table.
viii. Seneca Lateral: the Texas Eastern Pipeline listed between MP 23.01 to 23.13 is not on the alignment sheet – it potentially needs to be changed to "transmission line";	Updated table.
ix. Berne Lateral: the table indicates a break in the existing Blue Racer Midstream Pipeline right-of-way between MP 0.45 to 0.53, which is not reflected in the alignment sheet. Rather, the Blue Racer Midstream Pipeline shows as contiguously adjacent on the alignment sheet from MP 0.19 to 0.87;	This is not the case. There is an approx 40' offset from Blue Racer between MP 0.45 and MP 0.53.
x. Berne Lateral: the Unknown Pipeline listed in the table between MP 2.49 to 3.24 is labeled as Texas Eastern Pipeline;	Table updated to include MP 2.43 to MP 2.56 parallel to Blue Racer. From MP 2.56 to MP 3.24 parallel to Texas Eastern.
xi. Clarrington Lateral: The East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline listed in the table between MP 0.69 to 1.59 is labeled in the alignment table as Dominion Pipeline;	Updated table.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
xii.	Clarington Lateral: an East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline between MP 11.1 to 11.2 is not listed in the table;	Updated table.
xiii.	Clarington Lateral: the Dominion Pipeline listed in the table between MP 11.44 and 12.53 is labeled on the alignment sheet as Eastern Ohio Gas Company Pipeline;	Updated table.
xiv.	Clarington Lateral: the Dominion Pipeline listed in the table between MP 13.05 to 15.10 is from MP 13.05 to 13.15 on the alignment sheet;	Rover is following an existing pipeline corridor from MP 13.05 to MP 18.20, and cross over several times. The table was updated to account for the change in ownership where we cross over to the other side of the corridor. Mileposts vary slightly from those listed here based on more accurate GIS measurement.
xv.	Clarington Lateral: an East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline between approximately MP 13.2 to 13.8 is on the alignment sheet but is not in the table;	Updated table. See comment above.
xvi.	Clarington Lateral: an East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline between approximately MP 13.9 to 15.4 is on the alignment sheet but not in the table;	Updated table. See comment above
xvii.	Clarington Lateral: the East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline listed in the table between MP 15.10 to 18.20 begins around MP 15.45 on the alignment sheet. At MP 16.5 through 16.8, the name changes to Blue Racer Midstream Pipeline;	Updated alignment sheet & table.
xviii.	Clarington Lateral: the East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline listed in the table between MP 18.88 to 21.29 is actually broken up into the following: Dominion Pipeline from MP 18.88 – 19.1, Blue Racer Midstream Pipeline between MP 19.1 to 19.5, East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline between 19.5 to 20.2, and East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline between 20.25 to 21.29;	Rover is following multiple existing pipeline corridors from MP 18.88 to MP 21.29, and cross over several times. The table was updated to account for the change in ownership where we cross over to the other side of the corridor. Mileposts vary slightly from those listed here based on more accurate GIS measurement.
xix.	Clarington Lateral: the Transmission Line listed in the table between MP 29.17 to 29.76 ends around MP 29.27 on the alignment sheet;	No survey data available on tract OH-HA-CC-012.500, 012.000, 013.000 and 014.000. Data included based on aerial interpretation and survey data on each side of these tracts.
xx.	Majorsville Lateral: The Unknown Pipeline listed in the table between MP 1.94 to 2.18 is not labeled on the alignment sheet;	No survey data available on tract WV-MA-ML-014.000. Data included based on aerial interpretation.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
xxi.	Majorsville Lateral: the Columbia Gas Pipeline listed in the table between MP 11.06 to 11.51 looks to end near MP 11.2 on the alignment sheet;	Updated table
xxii.	Majorsville Lateral: the Dominion Pipeline listed in the table as between MP 20.45 to 20.92 is labeled as East Ohio Gas Company Pipeline and should end near MP 20.7;	Updated table
xxiii.	Supply Connector Lateral: the end milepost of the Access Midstream Pipeline looks to be around 8.5 according to the alignment sheet, not 8.02 as is listed in the table;	This is not the case. The pipeline starts to deviate from the Access Midstream Pipeline at a slight angle at the PI at MP 8.02. Table updated to read "Midstream Pipeline".
xxiv.	Burgettstown Lateral: the Unknown Pipelines listed in the table between MP 0.37 to 0.54, MP 1.82 to 2.72, MP 3.13 to 3.33, and MP 4.22 to 4.51 are not labeled in the alignment sheet;	No survey data available at the identified locations. Data included based on aerial interpretation.
xxv.	Mainlines A and B: the Unknown Foreign Pipeline listed in the table between MP 22.46 to 22.92 is labeled as Midstream Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Updated table
xxvi.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 170.89 to 171.56 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxvii.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 171.56 to 172.35 is not on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxviii.	Market Segment: the Great Lakes Gas Pipeline listed on the table between MP 172.35 to 173.39 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxix.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 173.39 to 173.96 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet, and appears to begin at MP 173.7 and end at MP 175.17 on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxx.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 176.02 to 178.20 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet; there is also a break in the pipeline on the alignment sheet from MP 176.5 to 176.7;	Market route shortened; removed from project.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
xxx.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 178.44 to 178.83 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxii.	Market Segment: the Merit Energy Pipeline listed in the table between MP 183.10 to 183.97 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxiii.	Market Segment: the Transcanada Pipeline listed in the table between MP 188.52 to 190.22 appears to end at MP 189.7;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxiv.	Market Segment: the Great Lakes Gas Pipeline listed in the table between MP 198.60 to 199.73 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxv.	Market Segment: the Great Lakes Gas Pipeline listed in the table between MP 200.44 to 200.76 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxvi.	Market Segment: the Great Lakes Gas Pipeline listed in the table between MP 203.48 to 205.55 is labeled as Foreign Pipeline on the alignment sheet;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xxxvii.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 82.76 to 85.71 is not on the alignment sheet until MP 83.9;	No survey data available on the tract MI-WA-116.000 and MI-WA-117.000. Data included based on aerial interpretation.
xxxviii.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 87.41 to 87.54 is not on the alignment sheet;	No survey data available on the adjacent ITC fee tracts. Data included based on aerial interpretation.
xxxix.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 90.44 to 94.21 is not on the alignment sheet from MP 93.2 to 93.4;	No survey data available of tract MO-LI-044.000. Data included based on aerial interpretation and survey data on the adjacent tracts.
xl.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 94.21 to 98.62 is on the alignment sheet from MP 94.9 to 95.1;	ITC corridor varies in width up to 400 ft. The Market route is parallel to the ITC corridor throughout this area. Adjusted Market route termination to the new Vector meter site now follows the ITC corridor up to MP 99.15. Table updated to reflect revised route.
xli.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 99.15 to 102.38 is not on the alignment sheet from MP 98.7 to 99.2;	Market route adjusted. Comment is no longer applicable.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
xlii.	Market Segment: the ITC power line listed in the table between MP 105.9 to 108.98 is on the alignment sheet from MP 106.3 to 108.98; and	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xliii.	Market Segment: the Transmission Line listed from MP 193.42 to 194.81 is not on the alignment sheet.	Market route shortened; removed from project.
b.	The following are inconsistencies between table 1A-3 and the alignment sheets:	See below.
i.	Burgettstown Lateral: the dimensions for the ATWS at MP 7.53 and 7.63 have un-needed decimal places within the table;	Updated table.
ii.	Burgettstown Lateral: the Pipeline on alignment sheet 51 at MP 47.48 is labeled as "Foreign Pipeline" but identified as "Access Midstream" in table 1A-3;	Information contained in the tables is more detailed based on more recent survey data.
iii.	Seneca Lateral: Pipeline crossed on sheet 1 is listed as "ATERO RESOURCES PIPELINE", but identified as "ANTERO RESOURCES PIPELINE" in table 1A-3;	Updated table.
iv.	Seneca Lateral: ATWS at MP 2.59 is listed as 25 x 2430 in table 1A-3, but appears as 15 x 2430 on alignment sheet 4;	Updated alignment sheet.
v.	Seneca Lateral: table 1A-3 includes unreadable text in the justification for the ATWS at MP 20.16;	Updated table.
vi.	Clarrington Lateral: ATWS areas listed in table 1A-3 for MP 0.18 and 0.24 are listed in the table but not shown on the alignment sheets;	Unable to locate area of discrepancy. Verified all ATWS is depicted on alignment sheets and shown in table.
vii.	Clarrington Lateral: full extent of ATWS at MP 6.37 is not shown on the alignment sheets;	This ATWS falls outside of the viewport of the alignment sheet, but is completely shown on the HDD drawing CL-P4-41.
viii.	Clarrington Lateral: road crossed at MP 23.63 is identified as CR 331 in table 1A-3, but the alignment sheets identify the road as "State HWY 33 (St. Clairsville St)";	Updated table.
ix.	Mainlines A and B: ATWS's of 50x300 and 30x150 for horizontal directional drill (HDD) at MP 25.5 are shown on the alignment sheets but not in the table;	Updated table.

FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
x. Mainlines A and B: ATWS at MP 31.38 listed in table 1A-3 as 15x325, but appears on the alignment sheets as 15x350;	Updated table.
xi. Mainlines A and B: ATWS for MP 31.56 listed in table 1A-3 as 15x1365, but appears on the alignment sheets as 15x1000;	Updated table.
xii. Mainlines A and B: ATWS of 50x300 for HDD at MP 42 shown on the alignment sheets but not in table 1A-3;	Updated table.
xiii. Mainlines A and B: ATWS of 50x300 at MP 83.5 is shown on the alignment sheets but not in the table;	Updated table.
xiv. Mainlines A and B: full extent of false right-of-way, ATWS at MP 91.98 and 94.90 are not shown on the alignment sheets;	This ATWS falls outside of the alignment viewport, but is completely shown on the HDD drawing ML-P4-12
xv. Majorsville Lateral: ATWS's of 25x285 and 10x430 near MP 0.5 are shown on the alignment sheets but not identified in table 1A-3;	Updated table.
xvi. Majorsville Lateral: full extent of ATWS 50x1325 at MP 12.47 needs to be shown on the alignment sheets;	This ATWS falls outside of the alignment viewport, but is completely shown on the HDD drawing MJ-P4-46.
xvii. Berne Lateral: ATWS at MP 3.55 is listed in table 1A-3 as 25x245 but appears on the alignment sheets as 15x245; and	Updated alignment sheet.
xviii. CGT Lateral: ATWS at MP 4.17 is listed in table 1A-3 as 10x100 but appears on the alignment sheets as 15x100.	Updated table.
c. The following are inconsistencies between table 1A-4 and the alignment sheets:	See below.
i. depict temporary access roads and permanent access roads with different colors or symbols on the alignment sheets;	Access roads are designated as temporary or permanent via the naming convention (TAR vs PAR).
ii. Sherwood Lateral: table 1A-4 lists access road "WV-DO-SHC-001.970-PAR-1" but it is not shown on the alignment sheets;	This PAR does not fall within the viewport of the alignment sheets. This PAR is found on the Site Plan drawing P5-4-001 and Quad drawing USGS Quad Sherwood Sht 1 of 8
iii. Cadiz Lateral: Access road "OH-HA-MC-002.970-PAR-1A" is listed in table 1A-4 but is not shown on the alignment sheet. Additionally, verify that the width of 100 feet that is listed in the table is accurate;	This PAR does not fall within the viewport of the alignment sheets. This PAR is found on the Site Plan drawing P5-10-001 and Quad drawing USGS Quad Cadiz Lateral 1 of 2. The width of 100 ft is required for road and power easement.

FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
iv. Burgettstown Lateral: access roads “PA-WA-034.000-PAR-1” and “PA-WA-044.000-PAR-2” are on the alignment sheets (sheets 1 and 3) but are not found in table 1A-4;	Access roads removed from alignment sheets.
v. Clarington Lateral: access road “OH-BE-CC-079.970-TAR-13C” shown on the alignment sheet near MP 15.75, but not found in table 1A-4;	Updated table.
vi. Clarington Lateral: access road “OH-HA-CC-025.970-TAR-23” shown on the alignment sheets near MP 31.75, but is not found in table 1A-4;	Updated table.
vii. Mainlines A and B: the following access roads are listed in table 1A-4 but do not appear on the alignment sheets: OH-CA-001.000-PAR-3, OH-WA-037.000-PAR-6, OH-WA-099.000-PAR-8;	PAR-3 and PAR-8 fall outside the viewport of the alignment sheets. PAR-3 is shown on the Site Plan drawing P6-04-001 and Quad drawing USGS Quad Supply Connector 4 of 36. PAR-8 is shown on the Site Plan drawing P5-13-001 and Quad drawing USGS Quad Mainline14 of 36. PAR 6 has been updated on alignment sheet.
viii. Mainlines A and B: the access road in table 1A-4 identified as OH-CA-022.000-TAR-9 actually refers to a corresponding map feature OH-CR-044.000-TAR-8;	Updated alignment sheet to OH-CA-022.000-TAR-9.
ix. Mainlines A and B: access road identified as OH-AS-043.00-TAR-13 in table 1A-4 matches map features “Access Road TA-12”;	Updated alignment sheet to OH-AS-043.00-TAR-13.
x. Market Segment: access road MI-LA-081.000-TAR-16 is listed in table 1A-4, but does not appear on the alignment sheets;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
xi. Majorsville Lateral: access road WV-MA-ML-001.970-PAR-1 is listed in table 1A-4 but not shown on the alignment sheet;	Updated alignment sheet.
xii. Majorsville Lateral: access road WV-MA-ML-010.970-TAR-1C is shown on the alignment sheet, but not found in table 1A-4;	Updated Table.
xiii. Supply Lateral A and B: update the name for access road OH-HR-003.000-PAR-1 on the alignment sheet to match the identifier listed in table 1A-4;	Updated alignment to OH-HR-003.000-PAR-1.
xiv. Supply Lateral A and B: access road OH-HR-029.000-PAR-2 shown on the alignment sheets but not found in table 1A-4;	Access road is listed in Table 1A-4 and depicted on alignment sheet.

FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
xv. Supply Lateral A and B: access road OH-HR-042.545-TAR-6 is listed in table 1A-4, but the corresponding feature on the alignment sheets is identified as OH-HR-042.545-TAR-10; and	Updated alignment sheet to OH-HR-042.545-TAR-6.
xvi. Supply Lateral A and B: access road OH-HR-042.570-TAR-7 is listed in table 1A-4, but the corresponding feature on the alignment sheets is identified as OH-ST-018.000-TAR-7.	Updated alignment sheet to OH-HR-042.570-TAR-7.
d. The following are inconsistencies between table 1A-8 and the alignment sheets:	See below.
i. private roads and driveways are not included in table 1A-8 and are not consistently recorded on the alignment sheets. Examples include Clarington lateral MP 24.3, MP 24.7, MP 31.6, and Majorsville Lateral MP 0.3 (distances are approximate). All driveways and private roads should be clearly marked on the alignment sheets and included in table 1A-8;	Table addresses public road crossings only. Alignment sheets depict all roads as surveyed. Some areas that have not been surveyed may not depict private road crossings that are apparent on the aerial imagery.
ii. Clarington Lateral: at MP 18.12, table 1A-8 lists "TWP 272 (Roscoe RD)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 272 (Roscoe RD)." Reconcile TWP and CR;	Updated alignment sheet.
iii. Clarington Lateral: at MP 27.36, table 1A-8 lists "WP 254 (Jockey Hollow Road)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 254 (Jockey Hollow Road)." Reconcile TWP and CR;	Updated alignment sheet.
iv. Majorsville Lateral: at MP 0.43, table 1A-8 lists "CR 26 (Number 2 Ridge Rd)," but the it is not listed on the alignment sheet;	Unsurveyed area; updated alignment sheet.
v. Majorsville Lateral: at MP 4.0, table 1A-8 lists "CR 713 (Lower Stull Road)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR7/3 (Lower Stull Road)." Reconcile the difference in the road name;	Updated table.
vi. Majorsville Lateral: at MP 7.26, table 1A-8 lists "SR 88," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "State HWY 88." Reconcile HWY and SR;	Updated alignment sheet.
vii. Cadiz Lateral: at MP 1.47, table 1A-8 lists "CR509 (Freeman Rd)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "TWP 270 (Freeman Road)." Reconcile TWP and CR;	Updated table.

	FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
	viii. Cadiz Lateral: at MP 2.66, table 1A-8 lists "US HWY 22 (Cadiz Piedmont Rd)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "SR HWY 22 (Cadiz Piedmont Rd)." Reconcile SR and US;	Updated table.
	ix. Cadiz Lateral: at MP 2.85, table 1A-8 lists "CR 269 (Konaski Rd)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "TWP 269 (Kanoski Rd)." Reconcile TWP and CR;	Updated table.
	x. Burgettstown Lateral: In table 1A-8, township roads are abbreviated inconsistently. Sometimes it is "T" sometimes it is "TWP" and sometimes it is "TR";	Updated table.
	xi. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 3.7 (approximately), Shovel Road is not listed in either the table or the alignment sheets;	Shovel Rd is a private road. Updated alignment sheet to include, but not shown in table.
	xii. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 9.9, on the alignment sheet, TWP road 869 (Aunt Clara Road) is listed as crossing the right-of-way in two different locations and within 0.1 of mile. However, only one road is depicted on the aerial photography at the designated crossings;	Removed second road crossing on alignment sheet.
	xiii. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 17.53, table 1A-8 lists "T 246," but it is listed as "CR 246" on the alignment sheet. Reconcile between T and CR;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xiv. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 28.45, table 1A-8 lists "CR 260 (Hidden Acres Dr)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "Private Road";	Updated alignment sheet.
	xv. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 39.65, table 1A-8 lists "CR 35 Branch Rd," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 35 (Branch Creek)." Reconcile the road name;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xvi. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 43.94, table 1A-8 lists "CR 61 (Charlon Rd)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 35 (Chalon Rd)." Reconcile the road name;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xvii. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 49.53, table 1A-8 lists "SR 164 (Amsterdam Rd SW #2)," but it is listed as a "CR 164..." on the alignment sheet. Reconcile between SR and CR;	Updated alignment sheet.

	FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
	xviii. Burgettstown Lateral: at MP 49.68, table 1A-8 lists the "Wheeling & Lake Erie RR," but it is not listed on the alignment sheet;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xix. Supply Connector Lateral: at MP 42.17, table 1A-8 lists the "Buckeye trail," but it is not listed on the alignment sheets;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xx. Mainlines A and B: at MP169.62, table 1A-8 lists the "CSTX Railroad (NY Central Lines)," but it is not listed on the alignment sheet;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxi. Market Segment: at MP 16.58, table 1A-8 lists an abandoned railroad, but it is not listed on the alignment sheet;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxii. Market Segment: at MP 40.04, table 1A-8 lists "W Cadmus Rd," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "SR M-34 (West Cadmus Rd)." Reconcile the road name;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxiii. Market Segment: at MP 89.99, table 1A-8 lists "Emu Drive," but it is not listed on the alignment sheets;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxiv. Market Segment: at MP 93.34, table 1A-8 lists "W Schafer Rd," but it is listed on the alignment sheets as "Schafer." Reconcile the road name;	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxv. Market Segment: at MP 200.42, table 1A-8 lists "Trumble Rd," but it is listed on the alignment sheets as "Trumble Lane." Reconcile the road name;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
	xxvi. Market Segment: at MP 207.4, table 1A-8 lists "Indian Trail," but it is listed on the alignment sheets as "King Road." Reconcile the road name;	Market route shortened; removed from project.
	xxvii. Sherwood Lateral: at MP 3.6 (approximately), alignment sheet shows "Smith Run RD" crossing the right-of-way, but it is not listed in table 1A-8;	Smith Run Rd is a private road and therefore, not listed in the table.
	xxviii. Sherwood Lateral: at MP 9.75, table 1A-8 lists CR "60/2 (Sandy Creek Rd)" but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 60/2 (Shade Rd)." Reconcile the road name; and	Updated alignment sheet.
	xxix. Sherwood Lateral: at MP 37.44, table 1A-8 lists "TWP 490 (Brey Hollow Road)," but it is listed on the alignment sheet as "CR 490." Reconcile the road name.	Updated alignment sheet.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
Resource Report 2		
2-1	Address the following Scoping Comments that were not included in the January filing:	See below.
	a. Multiple, including C423-2 – Comments raised concerns for Project-related impacts on drinking water wells;	See Section 2.1.7
	b. C808-5 – Comment raised concerns for impacts on vernal ponds/pools that occur within the Project area; and	See Section 2.3
	c. C1087-4 – Comment raised concerns that new waterlines would not be allowed to be constructed through the Project right-of-way.	See Section 10.5.1.1 in Resource Report 10.
2-2	Section 2.0 (page 2-2) – Provide documentation of all wetland/waterbody permit applications submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), and a summary of Rover’s proposed compensatory mitigation.	None filed to date.
2-3	Section 2.1.1 (pages 2-2 to 2-6) – Provide a table of aquifers crossed by the Project that includes the following information:	See Table 2A-1
	a. crossing location(s) of each aquifer (start and end Project MPs of crossing);	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	b. type (e.g., surficial, glacial, bedrock);	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	c. approximate depth to aquifer from ground surface (in feet);	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	d. average yield (in gallons per minute [gpm]);	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	e. current and projected use;	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	f. water quality and any known or suspected contamination;	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	g. denote principal aquifers or clarify if no principal aquifers are crossed; and	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information
	h. planned protection measures for shallow aquifers.	Table 2A-1 has been updated with all available information

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
2-4	Section 2.1.2 (page 2-6) – Identify aquifers that would be crossed by the Project that are enrolled in state-designated programs or clarify that no state-designated aquifers would be crossed. Programs of interest may include state-designated significant recharge areas, or other critical areas where excessive use of groundwater poses a threat to the long-term integrity of a water-supply source, or preservation areas to protect natural resources including public water supply sources.	Section 2.1.3
2-5	Table 2.2-1 (page 2-12) and appendix 2A (table 2A-4) – The number of Intermediate and Minor waterbody crossings in table 2.2-1 differs from the numbers provided in appendix 2A (table 2A-4). Reconcile the differences, or update and file tables with appropriate footnotes to explain the difference.	Table 2.2-1 and 2A-5 have been revised and updated with the most recent information.
2-6	Tables 2.2-1 and 2.3-1(pages 2-12 and 2-24) and appendix 2A (tables 2A-4 and 2A-9) – Upon completion of surveys, provide updated tables to include the information for the remaining approximately 16 percent of waterbodies and wetlands that had not been surveyed as of the January 26, 2014 filing.	Survey data beyond October 2014 will be provided in an addendum report to be submitted when available or by the 3 rd Quarter 2015.
2-7	Section 2.2.2 (page 2-11) and attachment 1A – Drainage features are defined in the section as waterbodies and are depicted with purple lines on the alignment sheets; however, drainage features are not listed as waterbody crossings in table 2A-4. Verify whether or not the drainage features portrayed on the alignment sheets are considered to be waterbodies, and revise the applicable text and tables to reflect the appropriate crossings.	Drainages fall under optional crossing procedures, and therefore, are not classified as waterbodies unless flowing. Drainages are discussed in Section 2.2, and a list of drainages crossed by Project is provided in Table 2A-6.
2-8	Section 2.2.4 (page 2-18) and appendix 2A (table 2A-4) – Section 2.2.4 states that six waterbodies would be crossed by Mainline B only, while table 2A-4 states that three waterbodies would be crossed by Mainline B only. Clarify this discrepancy.	The text states correctly that 6 waterbodies are crossed by Mainline B only, and this is shown in the table. Waterbodies crossed by Mainline B only at located at MPs 53.26, 66.14, 66.48, 134.86, 135.86, and 190.76.
2-9	Section 2.2.5 (page 2-19) – Section 2.2.5 indicates that there would be no permanent impacts on open water. However, table 8A-2 reports about 15 acres of permanent impacts on open water. Provide a discussion on the nature of impacts for these acres of open water.	There is no indication in Section 2.2.5 that there will be no permanent impacts to open water. Open water features (i.e. lakes and ponds) crossed by the Project are summarized in Table 2.2-1 and listed in Table 2A-4.
2-10	Section 2.2.6 (page 2-20) – Provide the rates (in gpm) for all hydrostatic test water withdrawals or include a statement that withdrawals would not exceed a certain rate.	Section 1.6.1.1

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
2-11	Section 2.3 (page 2-21) – Provide documentation of permitting agency correspondence/ consultation regarding wetland surveys and delineations.	See Section 2.3.4
2-12	Table 2.3-1 (page 2-24) and appendix 2A (table 2A-9) – Reconcile acreage discrepancies between the two tables (i.e., permanent and total acreages).	Table 2.3-1 and 2A-11 (previously 2A-9) have been revised and updated with the most recent information.
2-13	Appendix 2A (table 2A-4) – Update and file the table per the following:	
	a. include waterbodies crossed by the CGT Lateral or clarify that no waterbodies would be crossed; and	Two waterbodies are crossed by the CGT at MPs 0.01 and 5.63. These were included in table 2A-4 in the previous filing.
	b. consistently denote waterbodies that would be crossed by the HDD method (*).	Table 2A-4 has been revised to denote all waterbodies crossed via HDD.
2-14	Appendix 2A (table 2A-4) and section 3.1.2 – Update the table and/or text in the section to rectify the following discrepancies:	See below.
	a. Burgettstown Lateral, Kings Creek Crossing is discussed in the section as being crossed at MP 9.5; but the table lists the crossing at MP 6.39; and	Text of Section 3.1.2 has been revised to match table 2A-4.
	b. Burgettstown Lateral, Aunt Clara Fork is discussed in the section as being crossed at MP 10.6; but the table lists the crossing at MP 8.87.	Text of Section 3.1.2 has been revised to match table 2A-4.
2-15	Appendix 2A (tables 2A-4 and 2A-5) – Provide waterbody identifiers for all waterbodies listed in the tables, or include a footnote that the waterbody identifier is pending completion of field delineations. Revise the alignment sheets to identify and delineate all waterbodies listed in the tables.	Footnote has been added to Table 2A-4 and 2A-5 to indicate a waterbody identifier is pending completion of field surveys for those marked with a “ – “ under the Waterbody ID.
2-16	Appendix 2A (tables 2A-5) – Add Aunt Clara Fork (Washington County, Pennsylvania) to the table as an Approved Trout Water.	Aunt Clara Fork has been added to Table 2A-5.
2-17	Appendix 2A (table 2A-9) – Revise the table to report total length of wetland crossings consistently for wetlands within the right-of-way but not crossed by the centerline and add a footnote describing how these lengths were derived.	Crossing lengths removed where the wetland is only located within the workspace. Footnote added to Table 2A-9.
2-18	Appendix 2A and attachment 1A (alignment sheets) – Resolve the following discrepancies between appendix 2A tables and the alignment sheets:	See below.
	a. Table 2A-4 –	See below.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
i.	the table lists the crossings of waterbodies S3ES-MA-128 and S1ES-BE-158 as occurring at MP 1.29; however, the alignment sheets show that waterbodies would be crossed at MP 9.67 and MP 16.61, respectively;	Unable to locate area of discrepancy. Waterbodies S3ES-MA-128 and S1ES-BE-158 are appropriately listed at MPs 9.67 and 16.61.
ii.	waterbody S2TB-WA-100 in the table is labeled as Waterbody 2TB-WA-100 in the alignment sheets;	Updated table.
iii.	the table is inconsistent with the alignment sheets as to the locations of waterbody crossings that would take place along Mainline B;	Update Table 2A-5
iv.	the Belle River HDD (according to the table) is identified as the Kronner Road HDD in the associated Site-Specific HDD Crossing Plan;	The Belle River is no longer crossed by the Project.
v.	Waterbody S2K-LE-227 is labeled as "Raisin River" in the table and "Hazen Creek" on the alignment sheet;	The alignment sheets are incorrect. According to USGS topographic mapping, S2K-LE-227 is the Raisin River. The confluence of the Raisin River and Hazen Creek is just northwest of the pipeline crossing.
vi.	Waterbody S2K-MA-331 is labeled as "Shaver Drain" in the table and "Ashery Creek" on the alignment sheet;	This waterbody is no longer located in the table or on the alignment sheets. See revised Table 2A-4.
vii.	there is a Site-Specific HDD Crossing Plan for Lake at Vines Road (Market Segment, approximate MP 95). This crossing is not listed in the table; and	This feature is a wetland feature identified as W2K-LI-251, and is listed in the wetland crossings table 2A-11 (previously table 2A-9) at MP 95.01.
viii.	there is a waterbody at MP 71.63 of the Market Segment that appears on the alignment sheet; however, it is not labeled and does not appear in the table.	The waterbody was not surveyed as of October 2014 and was not identified as a perennial waterbody on USGS topographic mapping.
b.	Table 2A-9 –	Now Table 2A-11
i.	the labels are not accurately linked to the correct feature (e.g., W4ES-CA-151 and W7H-WA-168 labels do not point to the respective wetlands);	Revised figure.
ii.	missing labels (e.g., W4ES-CA-254, W2TB-MO-140);	Updated Table 2A-11
iii.	W2ES-HR-260 in the table but is labeled as W2ES-HR-261 on the alignment sheet; and	W2ES-HR-260 is listed as a wetland in table 2A-11 (previously 2A-9) and W2ES-HR-261 is listed as a waterbody in table 2A-5.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	iv. W6H-RI-101 is shown as Palustrine forested in the alignment sheet and Palustrine shrub in the table.	Table 2A-4 has been revised to reflect W6H-RI-101 is a forested wetland.
2-19	Attachment 1A (alignment sheets) – Revise the alignment sheets and associated text and tables to account for the following discrepancies:	See below.
	a. there are aquatic features along the Market Segment that appear to be crossed using the HDD method that are not delineated (i.e. the Delapp Lane HDD [~MP 86], the CR D32 [Patterson Lake Road] HDD [~MP 86], and the Swamp near Jewel Road HDD [~MP 97]);	All evaluated and addressed as appropriate.
	b. erroneous or duplicate symbology for water resources appear on the alignment sheets. In addition, some symbology is missing (e.g., waterbodies S2TB-JE-282 and S1M-WA-151);	All evaluated and addressed as appropriate.
	c. there are several waterbody features that appear to cross the right-of-way; however, the delineation is truncated at the edge of the pipeline corridor and therefore is not classified as a waterbody crossing (e.g., S4H-CR-158, Mainline, ~ MP 114.3); and	All evaluated and addressed as appropriate.
	d. some labels are pointing to the incorrect features (e.g., waterbody S1K-WA-173), and other labels are not visible (e.g., waterbody S2ST-JE-108 is obscured by another feature's label).	All evaluated and addressed as appropriate.
2-20	Volume IIB – 2A – M1 (page 2) – Wetland Delineation Report Table 1 – Waters of the U.S. Delineation Report for MDEQ, Jackson, East Lansing District – table 1 was not provided.	Table 1 has now been added to the Wetland Delineation Report.
Resource Report 3		
3-1	General – Provide details of pending surveys, survey results, federal and state agency correspondence, and Project-specific impact avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and conservation measures for listed species and species of concern including:	Will update as the Project progresses.
	a. section 3.4.1.4 (p 3-22): eastern massasauga;	Table 1.3-6; Section 3.4.1.3 Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.1.3 references Section 3.4.3 which contains survey information and mitigation and avoidance measures along with Section 3.4.2)

FERC Comment	Section Where Comment is Addressed
b. section 3.4.1.4 (p 3-23): eastern hellbender;	Table 1.3-6 , RR 1 Section 3.4.1.3 Section 3.4.2; and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.1.3 references Section 3.4.3 which contain survey information and mitigation and avoidance measures along with Section 3.4.2)
c. section 3.4.1.5 (p 3-24, 3-26): Snuffbox Mussel (<i>Epioblasma triquetra</i>), White Catspaw Mussel (<i>Epioblasma obliquata perobliqua</i>) and Northern Riffleshell (<i>Epioblasma torulosa rangiana</i>);	Table 1.3-6 , RR 1; Section 3.4.1.4; Section 3.4.2; and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.1.4 references Section 3.4.3 which contain survey information and mitigation and avoidance measures along with Section 3.4.2)
d. section 3.4.2 (p 3-27): West Virginia listed mussel species in accordance with the West Virginia Mussel Survey Protocol, March 2014 version;	Table 1.3-6, RR 1; Section 3.4.2; and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 contain survey information mitigation and avoidance measures)
e. section 3.4.2 (p 3-27): stalked bulrush (<i>Scirpus pedicellatus</i>), heartleaf meehania (<i>Meehania cordata</i>), and snow trillium (<i>Trillium nivale</i>);	Table 1.3-6, RR 1; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 contain survey information, mitigation and avoidance measures)
f. section 3.4.2 (p 3-28), attachment 1D (PDF page 235): Ohio and Michigan listed threatened, endangered, species of concern and sensitive species; and	Table 1.3-6, RR 1 ; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 contain survey information, mitigation and avoidance measures)
g. Attachment 1D (PDF page 186): Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) identified tree species that have relatively high value as potential Indiana Bat roost trees.	Table 1.3-6, RR 1 Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 of RR3 (Pending Survey data provided in Table 1.3-6; Correspondence is provided in Volume II, RR1, Appendix D; Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.4.3 contain survey information and mitigation and avoidance measures)

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
3-2	Section 3.1.1 (page 3-3) – This section only designates Pennsylvania with freshwater warmwater fisheries. Include Pennsylvania as part of the Project area that includes both freshwater warmwater fisheries and coldwater fisheries (e.g., Kings Creek in Washington County, Pennsylvania is listed as coldwater fisheries in appendix 2A, table 2A-4).	See Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.2 (revised).
3-3	Section 3.1.2.1 (page 3-4) – Provide correspondence, including discussions about trout stocking, with West Virginia Department of Natural Resources regarding the crossing of Wheeling Creek at MP 2.8, and update the corresponding reference.	See Section 3.1.2.2 and Volume 2, RR2, Appendix D (provided correspondence)
3-4	Section 3.1.2 – Kings Creek and Aunt Clara Fork are a designated Approved Trout Water/Coldwater Fishery. In addition, ODNR recommends impacts to designated coldwater habitats be avoided. The section identifies 24 coldwater habitat streams. Currently none of these waterbodies are proposed to be crossed via the HDD method; therefore provide a discussion on the specific avoidance/minimization measures or time-of-year restrictions that would be employed for these sensitive crossings.	See Section 3.1.2.3 Section 3.1.3 (Added requested information and correspondence with PFBC and OEPA representatives)
3-5	Section 3.1.2.3 (page 3-4) – Provide additional detail for the 24 coldwater habitat streams in Ohio to designate which streams are classified as either “Coldwater Habitat – inland trout streams”, or “Coldwater Habitat – native fauna”.	See Section 3.1.2.3 (Information provided)
3-6	Section 3.2.1 (page 3-7) – Revise section 3.2.1 to discuss existing vegetative resources by vegetation type (e.g. upland forest, forest wetland, emergent and scrub shrub wetland, upland open land, etc.) instead of by ecoregion.	See Section 3.2.1, Table 3A-2, and Section 3.3.1. (Removed Ecoregion Section; referenced Table 3A-2 for dominant plant species within each habitat type in each state identified in the Project area)
3-7	Section 3.2.3 (page 3-12) – Provide a table quantifying the acreages of each vegetative community affected by the Project. This table should correspond to the vegetation community types presented in Resource Report 3, appendix A - table 3A-2 Vegetation Community Types and Representative Plant Species. Include impacted acreages by state and Project component.	Added Table 3A-3.
3-8	Section 3.5.1 (p 3-31) – Provide documentation of continuing consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding pipeline-related impacts on migratory bird species and Project-specific conservation measures for migratory birds.	Section 3.5.1 Volume II, Resource Report 1 (Information provided)
<p>Resource Report 4 All material filed with the Commission containing location, character, and ownership information about cultural resources must have the cover and any relevant pages therein clearly labeled in bold lettering: "CONTAINS PRIVILEGED INFORMATION--DO NOT RELEASE."</p>		

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
4-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014:	See below.
	a. RR4-3: Include the Correspondence from the White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe from January 12, 2015;	The response was added in Volume IV, Attachment 4A, is dated 1/5/15, and was received on 1/12/15.
	b. RR4-10: The Ohio and Erie Canal is identified in the RR, but not included in the appendix 4A table. Include a discussion of the canal's significance and how it is being avoided; and	See Section 4.4.2.3
	c. RR4-12: Provide any State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) comments on the Unanticipated Discoveries Plans.	See Section 4.7
4-2	General – Provide the SHPOs' comments on the Cultural Resource Technical Reports, when available.	See Sections 4.6.1 – 4.6.4
4-3	General – Update the section to reflect the follow-up activities Rover has conducted with the tribes.	See Table 4A-13
4-4	Section 4.4 –	See below.
	a. Verify Rover would avoid all National Register of Historic Places-eligible sites.	See Sections 4.4.2.3 and 4.4.2.4
	b. Explain how Rover would avoid adverse effects to architectural resource CAR0266012 (1843 Federal House) (e.g., relocate Mainline Compressor Station 1 in Ohio).	See Section 4.4.3.3
	c. Clarify whether or not Rover would avoid the unevaluated deep testing areas/sites in West Virginia.	See Section 4.4.2.1
4-5	Sections 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3, and 4.6.4 – Update the sections to state that the reports were provided to the SHPOs on January 26, 2015.	Complete.
4-6	Section 4.6.5 – Provide any previously unfiled correspondence with the Native American tribes contacted.	Complete.
4-7	Section 4.8 – The section indicates that the reports were submitted to “Native American tribes, and other consulting parties as appropriate.” Clarify whether or not this has been done, and if so, identify the recipients of the reports. Ensure that Native American tribes receive any requested information or reports.	See Section 4.0
4-8	Attachment 4A – Provide the February 5, 2015 email sent to the canal societies, and any resulting comments.	See Attachment 4A

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
4-9	Appendix 4A – Provide a table for outstanding surveys by milepost and pipeline segment(s) (or include a milepost column in the existing tables).	See Table 4A-12
4-10	Appendices 4A-1, 4A-2, and 4A-3 – Provide the report references footnote.	Complete.
4-11	Appendix 4A and Appendix 4B – Resolve contact lists inconsistencies: The Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa are listed in contacts in appendix 4B on page 13, but are not listed in groups contacted in appendix 4A pages 37-38.	See Table 4A-13
4-12	Appendix 4A – Update temporary site number in table 4A-5 on page 9 to 36WH1693.	Complete.
4-13	Appendix 4A and Attachment 4F – Resolve inconsistencies between the number of sites in table 4A-6 on pages 10-14 in appendix 4A and the number of sites identified in attachment 4F on page i and page 437.	Complete.
4-14	Appendix 4A and Attachment 4G – Resolve inconsistencies between the number of sites in table 4A-7 on pages 15-18 in appendix 4A and the number of sites identified in attachment 4G on page ii and page 15-1.	Changes associated with Vector have resulted in changes in these numbers. Updated and correct information is provided in Section 4.4.2.4 and Table 4A-7.
4-15	Appendix 4A and Attachment 4G – Resolve inconsistencies between the number of architectural properties in table 4A-11 on pages 26-31 in appendix 4A and the number of architectural properties identified in attachment 4G on page ii.	Changes associated with Vector have resulted in changes in these numbers. Updated and correct information is provided in Section 4.4.3.4 and Table 4A-11.
4-16	Appendix 4B – Resolve inconsistencies between figure 1.2 (mapping) which depicts the CGT and Sherwood Laterals as 100 percent complete, and table 4A-1 which indicates 96 percent and 98 percent respectively.	See Table 4A-1
4-17	Volume IV – Update the Cultural Resource Reports as follows:	See below.
	a. provide the addendum survey reports (required due to denied access/unfinished surveys), and any evaluation reports (both archaeological and architectural) when available; and	Complete
	b. update all site tables and route mapping to include Project mileposts.	Complete
Resource Report 5		
5-1	Provide an estimate of total local capital expenditures, (i.e., purchases made by contractors for construction and/or restoration equipment or materials).	See Section 5.2.3.1

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
5-2	Section 5.2.1.1 (p 5-4) – Provide additional detail regarding Rover’s proposed workforce composition. Specifically, identify how Rover would fulfill its proposal to hire local workers for various project activities. As necessary, identify what trades are likely to compose the local workforce.	See Section 5.2.1.1
5-3	Section 5.2.3.1 (page 5-6) and Appendix 5A – Table 5A-9 Remove the total Project expenditures listed next to the counties or replace them with expected local expenditures within those counties.	See Section 5.2.3.1
5-4	Section 5.2.3.1 (page 5-6) – Provide an estimate of the total taxes that would be paid on direct expenditures during construction and provide a breakdown by federal, state and local taxes.	See Section 5.2.3.2
5-5	Section 5.2.4 – Provide additional detail regarding Rover’s discussion of public services in the project area. At a minimum, provide supporting evidence that existing services can absorb any demands created by the influx of workers.	See Section 5.2.4.1
5-6	Section 5.2.5.1 (page 5-8) – Develop a Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan. The Plan should detail mitigation of impacts associated with in-road construction, including prior notification and maintained access for home and/or business owners and emergency response vehicles, measures to assure construction personnel utilized permitted roads only, and post construction actions associated with cleanup and repair of roads damaged. Details on mitigation should address:	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
	a. increased traffic, detours, and road closures;	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
	b. compaction;	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
	c. prior notification;	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
	d. maintaining access for home or business owners;	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
e.	in-road work relative to peak-traffic periods;	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
f.	safety measures (including signage, fencing and assurance of immediate back fill of trenches);	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
g.	noise impacts; and	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
h.	timing of and assurance for the completion of any necessary road repairs due to construction activities.	See Sections 5.2.5.1 in Resource Report 5 & 1.6.1.5 in Resource Report 1, and Residential Access and Traffic Management Plan in Volume IIA, Appendix 1B.
5-7	Section 5.3 (p 5-12) – Update the section to address the fact that the majority of counties crossed (78 percent) are below the poverty levels of their respective state.	See Section 5.3
5-8	Table 5A-7 – Update the table to reconcile the discrepancy in the peak construction workforce numbers; the individual numbers do not sum to the total.	See Section 5.2.1.1 & Table 5A-7
Resource Report 6		
6-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014:	See below.
a.	RR6-6: Update the table to include information on permitted but not yet active mines and wells. Also update the table to include the distance and direction from underground mines to the Project;	Table 6A-5, Mines within 0.25 mile of the Pipeline. Permitted wells listed in the databases are provided. To be active in the future is not a field in the database. A footnote is included for subsurface mines that there is no distance or direction. The subsurface mines presented are directly under the Pipeline. There were no other subsurface mines detected within 0.25 mile of the Pipelines that were not crossed. A column was added to clarify surface and subsurface mines for the reader.
b.	RR6-7: Update the table to include a definition of or explanation for the use of 'unknown' for well type;	Table 6A-6 Oil and Gas Wells within 0.25 mile of the Pipelines. This data was not publicly available.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	c. RR6-8: Update the section to include a discussion of potential impacts or mitigation measures related to areas of hard bedrock and provide a Blasting Plan; and	Section 6.3, Blasting. Potential impacts from the bedrock present and the mitigation measures when encountered are provided. A Blasting Plan is provided.
	d. RR6-11: Provide a map of historic landslides in the Project area.	Figure 6B-3, Landslide Hazard of the Project Area, presents the area historical landslide types and the incident and susceptibility rates.
6-2	Address the following Scoping Comments not addressed in the January filing:	See below.
	a. DE-31: Comment raises concerns for Trenton limestone karst formation; and	Sec. 6.4.5
	b. DE-32: Comment raises concerns for abandoned oil wells with unknown locations and mitigation measures.	See Table 6A-6
6-3	General – Provide sources for all tables and statements of facts presented in the section.	See Sec. 6.6
6-4	General – Update the section and corresponding tables to include the following information for access roads, contractor yards, mainline valves (MLV), and ATWS:	See below.
	a. physiographic information such as relief, steep slopes, surficial geology, and bedrock geology; and	See Sec. 6.1.1, 6.1.2
	b. geologic hazards including soil liquefaction, landslides/steep slopes, subsidence, karst terrain, flooding, and any other recognized hazards that could affect proposed Project construction or operation.	See Sec. 6.4
6-5	Section 6.1 (page 6-2) – Provide general information for the Supply Lateral segments. Provide general topographic relief and elevations for the Mainlines A and B and the Market Segment.	See Sec. 6.1
6-6	Section 6.1 (page 6-2) – Provide a discussion of the physiography, elevations, slopes, and general conditions for aboveground facilities.	See Sec. 6.1
6-7	Section 6.2.1 (page 6-8) – Revise table 6.2.1 to include all mines (include coal mines both surface and underground) located within 0.25 mile and the number of total wells within 0.25 mile of the Project by county.	See Table 6.2-1 and Table 6A-6
6-8	Section 6.2.1 (page 6.8) – Provide a list of underground mines within 0.25 mile of the Project. Include the:	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	a. distance and direction from the Project;	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	b. state in which it is located;	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	c. associated pipeline segment;	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	d. beginning and ending Project mileposts at which each mine is located;	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	e. mine name;	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	f. resource being mined; and	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
	g. current use status.	See Table 6A-5 and 6A-6
6-9	Section 6.2.1 (page 6-10) – Identify specific measures that would be taken to protect the integrity of the pipeline in areas of active mining. Include a discussion of blasting and heavy equipment operation and excavation in proximity to the pipeline.	See Section 6.2.1
6-10	Appendix 6A (Table 6A-6) – Provide a table footnote that identifies the difference between ‘active’ and ‘producing’.	See Table 6A-6
6-11	Appendix 6A (Table 6A-7) – Update the table to report units for the Hypocentral Depth.	See Table 6A-7

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
Resource Report 7		
7-1	Section 7.2.8.1 (page 7-14) – Provide the timing for post-construction restoration steps, including soil amendments and seeding for the portion of the route where dual 42-inch-diameter pipe would be installed.	Section 1.6.1.1 in Resource Report 1.
7-2	Section 7.3.3 – Update the section or states’ Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plan to include a discussion of the post-construction monitoring of lands with drain tile lines/systems. Specifically, the discussion should include detail on the process of post-construction follow-up for landowners, i.e., how and who they can contact and the timing of repairs where issues may arise. Also, clarify whether or not the mitigation measures for drain tiles outlined in the Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plans would also be applied for drain tiles crossed in Pennsylvania and West Virginia.	See Section 7.3.3
7-3	Appendix 7A (Table 7A-2) – Define or correct the title for the second column currently labeled ‘Leh (miles)’.	Complete
7-4	Appendix 7A and Attachment 7A – Provide a table(s) detailing soil characteristics and/or acreage of impact for both temporary and permanent access roads, and contractor yards for soil limitations as they were provided in appendix 7A, table 7A1-1.	See Table 7A-5 and Table 7A-6
Resource Report 8		
8-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014:	See below.
	a. RR8-8: The section states that the Project would cross federal, state, and private lands; however the table indicates no federal lands crossed. Clarify the discrepancy. Additionally, the table contains a footnote definition, but the footnote does not appear in the actual table.	See Section 8.2 and Table 8.2-1
	b. RR8-10: Update the discussion on the Pinckney Recreation Area to include a discussion of seasonal restrictions for construction to avoid peak use of the area, impacts on any trails crossed by the Project or nearby parking/access points, and length of time trails would be closed due to construction of the Project.	See Section 8.4.2.4
8-2	Address the following Scoping Comments not addressed in the January filing:	See below.
	a. C446-11: Comment raised concerns for impacts on lands within the “State of Michigan Farmlands and Open Spaces Preservation Program”;	See Section 8.1.3.2

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
b.	C1084-7: Comment raised concerns for impacts on the Baker Preserve, an under-construction Washtenaw County park that would be crossed by the Market Segment near MP 75.4;	See Section 8.4.6
c.	Multiple comments including C378-3, C424-10, C630-1: Comments raised concerns for impacts on hunting in the Project area; and	See Section 8.2
d.	C878-1 and C476-5: Comments raised concerns for impacts on specialty crops/uses such as sap production and raspberry, boysenberry, and wild grapes.	See Section 8.2
8-3	Section 8.1.2 (page 8-2) – The section states permanent impacts from aboveground facilities would be 504.8 acres; however, appendix 8A-2 reports 510.89 acres. Clarify the discrepancy.	See Section 8.1.1 and Table 8A-1. Discrepancy resolved and impacts now total 509.1 acres.
8-4	Section 8.1.2.2 (page 8-4) – Clarify whether the entire site of each compressor station would be cleared within the fenced boundaries. If not, provide a detailed description for each site describing the modifications to existing land use types and resulting operational footprint (i.e., grass, gravel, etc.). Indicate where woody vegetation could be maintained around the site perimeter for noise and visual screening.	See Section 8.1.2.2 and Table 8A-2
8-5	Section 8.1.3.4 (page 8-11) – Update the residential land discussion to include Rover’s plan for structures that are within the boundaries of the construction right-of-way (i.e. purchase structure or relocate structure). See question RR1-28 above.	See Section 8.1.3.4
8-6	Section 8.1.3.7 (page 8-13) – Clarify the crossing method for the Timber Trace Gulf Club. The section states that it would be crossed using the HDD method, while appendix table 8A-4 lists the crossing method as “conventional.”	See Section 8.1.3.7
8-7	Section 8.3 (page 8-17) – Provide supporting information for the conclusion that no planned residential/commercial developments have been identified in the Project area. Provide copy of each appropriate correspondence and reference.	See Section 8.3 and Volume IIB, Attachment 1E
8-8	Section 8.4.6 (page 8-24) and table 8A-4 – Update the section and table to include the New Life Fellowship Church. Update the appropriate Resource Reports to discuss potential impacts on the church (e.g., visual, noise, and traffic impacts).	Rover is consulting with the Church to prepare a plan to minimize impacts.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
8-9	Section 8.5.1 (page 8-25) – Update the section to include a discussion of impacts on specific visual receptors such as recreators at nearby public lands and recreation areas, as well as residents in close proximity to the construction right-of-way.	See Section 8.5
8-10	Section 8.5.2 (page 8-26) – Update the visual assessment to include a discussion on the visual impacts for each compressor station and meter station individually. Provide additional details on the “small satellite dish” mentioned in section 1.3.2.2 (i.e., installment height, specific locations [by MP], and any other associated components that would be required for operation/use of the satellite dishes).	See Section 8.5
8-11	Appendix 8A (Table 8A-2) – Provide individual land use tables for each Project segment (i.e. for each of the nine laterals and each of the two mainlines for a total of 11 individual land use tables). The land use tables should include impacts for each land use category by Project Component (pipeline, aboveground facilities, ATWS, access roads, contractor yards), State, and County.	See Table 8A-2
8-12	Appendix 8A (Table 8A -3) and appendix 8B – Update the table and plans to address the following inconsistencies:	See below.
	a. there are several structures listed in the table as having a Site-Specific Residential Plan; however, no plan is provided; and	See Appendix 8B
	b. the table and plans are inconsistent in noting structures intended for purchase by Rover.	Updated Table 8A-3
8-13	Appendix 8B – Update the plans as follows:	See below.
	a. reconcile the discrepancy between the plans which note that there would be “no workspace closer than 8 feet to the home” and the site-specific residential plans depicting homes that are closer than 8 feet to construction workspace; and	See Appendix 8B. Site specific drawings have been updated to address discrepancies.
	b. depict with an aerial imagery background.	Site specific plans identify milepost locations for each route. Residences are viewable with imagery background on the alignment sheets.
Resource Report 9		
9-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014:	See below.
	a. RR9-5c: Update the table 9.1-1 to include the type of compression for each compressor station;	See Table 9A-1 footnotes.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	b. RR9-5f: Update the section to include a discussion on venting greenhouse gases and volatile organic compounds during operations; and	See Section 9.1.5.2
	c. RR9-9: Update the section to include the locations of all HDD entry and exit locations and the approximate time to complete each drill.	See Table 9.2-13 and Table 1A-7 in Resource Report 1
9-2	Address the following Scoping Comments not addressed in the January filing:	See below.
	a. C836-7: Comment raised concerns for the effect of relief valve noise on commodity production (such as milk and eggs);	See Section 9.2.18
	b. C838-9: Comment raised concerns for the effect of construction noise on training, disposition, and health of show horses located within 250 feet of construction;	See Section 9.2.15
	c. Multiple comments including CH36: Comments raised concerns for radioactive compounds emitted into the air; and	See Section 11.3.2
	d. DE-28: Comment raised concerns emissions from inadvertent industrial accidents.	See Section 9.1.5.2
9-3	General – Update the section to include a discussion on climate change.	See Section 9.1.4.1
9-4	Section 9.2 – Describe the likelihood of a pipeline blowdown event. This discussion should include the cause and frequency of a blowdown event, the approximate time it would take to evacuate gas from the pipeline, and the potential noise associated with the MLV based on an noise sensitive areas's (NSA) distance from the noise source.	See Section 9.2.14
9-5	Section 9.1.4.3 (page 9-18) – As indicated in the section, provide air permit applications for all compressor stations, including details on applicable state rules and requirements for air quality control.	See Appendix 9C
9-6	Section 9.1.4.4 (page 9-19) – Update the section to include detailed AERMOD modeling results for all compressor stations.	See Table 9A-19
9-7	Section 9.2.1.2 (page 9-23) – Update the section to include an analysis of applicable state/county/local noise and vibration regulations in all areas of Project construction (including pipeline).	See Section 9.2.1.2

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
9-8	Section 9.2.2 (page 9-23) – Update the section to include an equipment list, noise evaluation methodology, identification of NSA, baseline noise levels, and impact evaluations for the delivery metering stations where an NSA would be within 0.5 mile (in addition to compressor stations).	See Section 9.2.17. Analysis is underway
9-9	Sections 9.2.11.1 and 9.2.12.1 (pages 9-38 and 9-39) – The sections indicate audible sound sources from Albaugh, New Washington, Brillhart and Ross Roads for Mainline Compressor Station 3 and the Defiance Compressor Station. Verify the accuracy of these statements and update the discussions as appropriate.	See Section 9.2.11.1, Section 9.2.12.1
9-10	Section 9.2.16.1 (page 46) – Note that the FERC target sound limit of 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) is a 24-hour standard, not a nighttime standard.	See Section 9.2.16.1
9-11	Section 9.2.1.16.1 – Update the section to state that effort would be made to mitigate noise <u>prior</u> to offering relocation.	See Section 9.2.16.1
9-12	Appendix 9A, Table 9.2.1-1 and other weather tables for noise surveys (page 9-116) – Update the table to include the start time of the noise survey, and clarify whether the weather represents the start time or the entire duration of survey.	See Table 9.2.1 thru 10-1. Addressed in footnotes
9-13	Appendix 9A, Table 9.2.1-2 and other baseline sound level monitoring result tables (page 9-118) – Update the table to include the cutoff radius for identifying NSAs, (i.e. these are all NSAs within xx feet of a compressor station or other aboveground facility).	See Table 9.2.1-2
9-14	Appendix 9A (Tables 9A-9A through 9A-18A) – Provide calculations and assumptions, emission factors and basis, fuel consumption rates, and annual operations in support of the criteria pollutant emissions estimates.	See Resource Report 9 Appendices
Resource Report 10		
10-1	The no action alternative discussion should include the cost associated with other types of actions that are reasonably expected to occur.	See Section 10.3
10-2	Section 10.1 (page 10-7) – Provide a brief discussion of data used and a summary of the comparison and description of any differences between the impact analysis present in RR10 and that of the other RRs.	Complete
10-3	Section 10.4 (page 10-15) – Reconcile the number agreement in the section, “Two existing pipeline systems were evaluated to transport Project supplies: the Trunkline Gas Company (Trunkline) pipeline system, Vector Pipeline L.P. (Vector) pipeline system, and the TransCanada ANR East Pipeline System.”	Complete

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
10-4	Section 10.4 (page 10-15) – Update the section to include a discussion of potential systems alternatives for the following: Panhandle Eastern, Utica East Ohio Midstream (UEO - also as a route alternative), Columbia Pipeline System, and REX East.	See Section 10.4.2 for Panhandle Eastern. See Section 10.4.3 for UEO. See Section 10.4.4 for Columbia See Section 10.4.5 for REX East.
10-5	Section 10.4.2 (page 10-16) – Update the Vector discussion to reflect the recent Transportation Agreement.	See Section 10.4.7 (replaces Section 10.4.2)
10-6	Section 10.5.2.1 (page 10-22) – Update the section to provide a more detailed discussion of why the Sherwood West Alternate is not a viable alternative.	See Section 10.5.2.1
10-7	Section 10.5.2.1 (page 10-22), figure 10.5-1, and table 10.5-1 – The section, table, and figure are inconsistent as to the crossing of public lands for this alternative. Update as appropriate to reconcile the discrepancy.	Discrepancy has been resolved.
10-8	Section 10.5.2.2 (page 10-22) and table 10.5-2 – The section and table are inconsistent regarding several resources associated with this alternative. Update as appropriate to reconcile the discrepancy.	Discrepancy has been resolved.
10-9	Section 10.5.2.2 (page 10-22) – Update the section to include a discussion on US 50 and CR 9 corridors as potential route alternatives.	Route was considered but quickly dismissed due to significant terrain constraints. An alternate route is presented in Section 10.5.2.2.
10-10	Update the sections and tables as appropriate to reconcile the discrepancy regarding the percent collocation:	See below.
	a. Section 10.5.2.3 (page 10-23) and table 10.5-3; and	Complete
	a. Section 10.5.2.4 (page 10-23) and table 10.5-4.	Complete
10-11	Section 10.5.2.5 (page 10-23) and table 10.5-5 – There are a significant number of tracts crossed by the proposed route; however, zero residences are reported as being within 50 feet. Verify this data.	Verified
10-12	Section 10.5.3.3 (page 10-26) – Generate a comparison table for the portion of Mainline A and B (MP 6.0 to 182.0) and the corresponding NEXUS route that are described as being 20-30 miles apart. Update the text discussion accordingly.	Section 10.5.3.2 & Table 10.5-11
10-13	Table 10.5-5 and figure 10.5-5 – The table and figure are inconsistent regarding the crossing of public and protected lands. Update as appropriate to reconcile the discrepancy.	Complete

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
10-14	Section 10.6.1.1 (page 10-27) and table 10.6-1 – The route variation as titled in the section is inconsistent with the route variation as titled in the table. Update the text and table to reconcile the discrepancy.	Complete
10-15	Section 10.6.2 (page 10-28) and tables 10.6-4 through 10.6-8 – Update the tables and/or section discussion to reconcile the discrepancy with regard to the claim that the variations to be adopted would increase the pipeline routing to be adjacent to existing rights-of-way. The data in the tables shows that only one route variation (MP 67.99 to 81.75) offers a greater percent adjacent to existing right-of-way as compared to the corresponding segment of the proposed route.	Section 10.6.2 updated
10-16	Table 10.6-9 – Provide a more detailed evaluation for each of the landowner concerns listed in the table. The analysis should be tied to and related to specific requests presented in the comments and conclusions substantiated with data. Also, several issues identified in review are as follows:	Information is now contained in Table 10.6-3
	a. provide MP, town/state and tract number for all commenters in the table;	Complete
	b. for comments where a tract number, town/state, or milepost were not identified, provide supporting information on how Rover was able to evaluate the requested variation if location information was not available;	Complete
	c. for comment resolutions listed in the table as ‘Proposed reroute not feasible’, ‘Best route selected in area’, and ‘Reroute not feasible due to constraints’, provide additional detail to support these conclusions. The detail for each comment should identify the corresponding portion of the planned route, the proposed re-route to avoid (descriptive or in a figure, where applicable), and an explanation of why the re-route is not feasible and what specifically about the planned route makes it “best”;	Complete
	d. where landowners raised concerns based on specific resources or crossing location along their property, identify the resource and crossing location (i.e., start and end MP), and whether or not the resolution has been made to landowner satisfaction (i.e. if route is moved to parallel an existing right-of-way, resolution should indicate if reroute avoids area of landowner concern); and	Complete.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	e. resolutions that are conditioned based on survey permission should be revised and evaluated based on best available information. Since the proposed route was sited based on aerial imagery (and surveys have not been conducted), Rover should propose reroutes and evaluate resources with the same level of detail. Provide maps showing the route variations.	Landowner reroutes will be addressed on a site specific basis.
10-17	Sections 10.7 and 10.8 – Update the sections to provide a more detailed discussion of the process by which a site was identified and the steps taken to determine if the site was a viable location. Also, update the sections to include comparison tables for all proposed and alternative sites containing relevant environmental factors.	See Section 10.7 and 10.8 and Tables 10.7-1 thru 10
10-18	Table 10.7-1(page 10-30) – Update the table to include the Majorsville Compressor Station.	See Table 10-7.1
10-19	Section 10.7.1.2 (page 10-31) – Update the section to discuss the two alternative sites for the Seneca Compressor Station depicted in figure 10.7-2.	See Section 10.7.2.2
10-20	Section 10.7.1.3 (page 10-31) – Update the section to include an evaluation of the Clarington Alternate 3 in relation to the proposed location.	See Section 10.7.2.3
10-21	Section 10.8.1.5 (page 10-34) – Provide a more detailed discussion regarding the Majorsville Meter Station Alternative, including an evaluation of why the proposed site was chosen over the alternative site.	See Section 10.8.1.5
10-22	Section 10.8.2.1 (page 10-34) – Was an alternative site evaluated for the ANR Meter Station? If so, provide a discussion and figure. If an alternative site was not evaluated, provide a discussion on why no alternative was assessed.	See Section 10.8.2.1
10-23	Appendix 10A, Figures 10.5-1 through 10.5-11 – Update the figures as follows:	See below.
	a. include Project mileposts to provide relative location;	Complete
	b. depict <u>entire</u> proposed and alternative routes;	Complete
	c. include associated interconnector sites and compressor/meter stations;	Complete
	d. consider use of different color lines to represent the various Project components (example figure 10.5-4 which depicts both the Berne and Seneca Laterals); and	For consistency in mapping and ease of understanding, the color blue is used to identify all proposed routes, and the color red is used to identify alternate route considerations.

FERC Comment		Section Where Comment is Addressed
	e. consider an alternative background with more prominent features or include symbology for key environmental factors relative the respective alternative analyses (e.g., National Hydrography Dataset [NHD], National Wetlands Inventory [NWI] areas, public lands, cultural and historic resources).	
Resource Report 11		
11-1	As previously requested on December 31, 2014: RR11-2 – Update the section to clearly state how Rover would monitor for further changes in population density around the pipeline with regards to Class.	See Section 11.1.2.1
11-2	Address the following Scoping Comments not addressed in the January filing:	See below.
	a. C1168-10: Comment raises concerns for the ability of public service providers to meet demands of the Project and water sources for firefighters;	See Section 11.3.3
	b. C1156-8: Comment raises concerns for training and specialized equipment for first responders in the case of a pipeline emergency;	Rover is meeting with first responders to gather information to address concerns.
	c. DE-53: Comment raises concerns for stray voltage from the pipeline and potential impacts on his dairy cows; and	See Section 11.0
	d. C409-3: Comment raises concerns “BLACK ENERGY” and the potential for terrorists to gain control of our energy infrastructure.	Not addressed. Rover is unfamiliar with Black Energy and intent of stockholder.
11-3	Section 11.1.2 (page 11-4) – Update the section to clearly state how Rover would monitor for further changes in population density around the pipeline with regards to Class.	See Section 11.1.2.1
11-4	Section 11.3.2 (page 11-12) – Specify if MLV valve actuators would be remotely controlled.	See Section 11.3.2
11-5	Section 11.3.4 (page 11-13) – Update the section to outline the safety and response measures that Rover would implement, per its emergency response plan, especially measures that may go beyond Department of Transportation/Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration requirements.	See updated Section 11.3.4 and Section 11.3.5