Sheppard

February 13, 2026

Ms. Debbie-Anne A. Reese, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

RE: OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3
Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
Docket No. CP26-14-000
§ 375.308(x)
Environmental Information Request No. 1 for the MVP Boost Project

Dear Secretary Reese:

On October 23, 2025, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC filed an application in the above-captioned docket for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the MVP Boost Project (Project). On January 29, 2026, the Commission issued Environmental Information Request No. 1 for the Project. Mountain Valley provides its responses to the request herewith.

Certain attachments to the responses contain privileged and confidential information regarding subsurface conditions and third party mining. Mountain Valley is also submitting an updated list of affected landowners. Mountain Valley requests that, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 388.112, the Commission treat these attachments as nonpublic. Mountain Valley has marked the documents "CUI//PRIV – DO NOT RELEASE."

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 774-3104 or jbrough@sheppard.com. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jennifer Brough
Jennifer Brough
Counsel to Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

General

Question 1

Provide responses to the comments submitted by Maury W. Johnson (FERC accession no. 20251215-5231), Grace Terry (FERC accession no. 20251222-5043), and Carl E. Zipper (FERC accession no. 20251121-5121).

Response:

For ease of review, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC (MVP or Mountain Valley) has grouped the responses by topic area. As the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission, or FERC) is aware, the three commenters referenced are long-time MVP opponents and many of the concerns raised have been previously reviewed and addressed by the Commission. *See Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC*, 179 FERC ¶ 61,013 (2022) (addressing comments filed by the three commenters); *Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC*, 161 FERC ¶ 61,043 (2017) (same).

Public Engagement and Landowner Notification

Pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 157.6(d), MVP was required to notify affected landowners, defined as those that are: (1) directly affected (i.e., crossed or used); (2) abutting either side of an existing right-of-way or facility site or contains a residence within 50 feet of the proposed construction work area; or (3) within *one-half mile* of proposed compressors or their enclosures or LNG facilities.

To further landowner engagement, MVP voluntarily notified landowners within *3 miles* of the new Swann Compressor Station by letter in September 2025, prior to filing the FERC application. MVP then sent notices of the four public open houses to this same group.

To date, MVP has held multiple in-person public meetings for the Project, none of which was required by the Commission's regulations. MVP has longstanding relationships with landowners in the Project area, dating back more than a decade. There is no requirement that MVP send notifications to landowners along the entire 303-mile route of the MVP Mainline System (MVP Mainline) or hold open houses in every county as requested by the commenters. MVP is committed to continuing to engage in good faith discussions with affected landowners and stakeholders regarding the MVP Boost Project (Project). Like it has done for prior projects, MVP will prepare regular newsletters with Project updates and post them on the website, www.mvpboost.info, and mail them to affected landowners and

stakeholders. The first newsletter was mailed in November 2025 and posted on the website and FERC docket (Accession No. 20251201-0015). MVP personnel are available to respond to inquiries via email to mail@mountainvalleypipeline.info or by phone at 844-MVP-TALK.

With respect to Ms. Terry's assertion that consulting parties were not notified about the Project, Ms. Terry has not been identified as a consulting party with respect to the Project, as her property is more than three MVP Mainline milepost miles from the closest Project facility. Resource Report 4, Appendix 4-G identifies the interested parties to whom MVP sent notification letters in August 2025 regarding cultural resources consultation. Moreover, on November 13, 2025, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VADHR) issued a finding of no adverse effect within the Area of Potential Effects (within 0.5 mile of the Swann Compressor Station) (Accession No. 20251119-5167).

FERC Review of the MVP Boost Project

Commenters allege that MVP improperly segmented the review of the Swann Compressor Station from the Commission's review of the MVP Mainline. As clearly stated in the Application, MVP's pre-filing request in Docket No. PF15-3-000 for the MVP Mainline included a proposed fourth compressor station, the Swann Compressor Station, in Roanoke County, Virginia. Due to refinements in project design, the Swann Compressor Station was not included in the MVP Mainline certificate application filing in Docket No. CP16-10-000.

Once the MVP Mainline reached full utilization, MVP shippers expressed a need for additional capacity. MVP optimized the MVP Boost Project in response to the shipper's requests and proposed to construct the Swann Compressor Station on MVP-owned land in Montgomery County, Virginia. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, segmentation is defined as "an agency dividing a major federal action into smaller components to avoid the preparation of an EIS." *Gas Transmission Northwest, LLC*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,023 (2024). Segmentation is not at issue here as the Commission prepared a full Environmental Impact Statement for the MVP Mainline. The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ) recently stated the following about the MVP Mainline environmental review: "Construction of the MVP Mainline has been *the most regulated, inspected and monitored* linear utility construction project in Virginia in recent history, and perhaps ever." VDEQ, *Summary of Public Comments and DEQ Responses*, Draft Virginia Water Protection Permit No. 25-0752, at 30 (Dec. 23, 2025).

The Commission will conduct a full environmental review of the Project in compliance with all applicable regulatory and statutory requirements.

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Pipe Safety, Potential Impact Radius, Pigging

Comments regarding the safety of the MVP have been addressed extensively by both the Commission and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration ("PHMSA"). In 2023, MVP and PHMSA entered into a Consent Agreement whereby MVP agreed to perform certain enumerated Corrective Measures including inspection, testing, surveys, cathodic protection surveys, and in-line inspection/tool runs. MVP was required to file quarterly inspection reports with PHMSA. The reports are available on PHMSA's website at this link: https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/foia/phmsa-electronic-reading-room. On August 28, 2024, MVP submitted a final third-party report on the elbow failure that occurred on May 1, 2024, during a hydrostatic pressure test of the MVP Mainline. The third party determined that the pipe failure was a result of a manufacturer's defective weld. MVP proactively removed and replaced the pipe section, including its sister fitting in the same test section, before placing the pipeline in service in 2024.

With respect to the MVP Boost Project, as explained in Resource Report 11, in accordance with 49 CFR Part 192, Subpart O, MVP implements an integrity management program for the MVP Mainline system, which includes an Integrity Management Plan with procedures for monitoring and maintaining integrity in High Consequence Areas ("HCAs"). MVP has identified HCAs along its natural gas transmission system and based on MVP's HCA analysis, the existing Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations are not located in identified HCAs. The proposed Swann Compressor Station is located in an identified HCA and MVP will continue to manage its transmission system in accordance with its existing integrity management program during construction and operation of the proposed Project.

MVP also inspects its pipeline system using inline inspection tools, known in the industry as smart pigs, at least every 7 years, as required by 49 CFR Part 192, or more frequently if the baseline integrity assessment requires. These devices run inside the pipe and provide indications of internal and external metal loss, deformation, ovalities, and dent detection; valve, fitting, and casing locations; pipe repairs; and external metal objects in the vicinity of the pipeline. These inspections are intended to detect corrosion and third-party damage, among other issues.

Commenters questioned how the calculation of the "blast zone" (the "Potential Impact Radius") of the MVP Mainline would be impacted by the proposed Project. Pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 192, the Potential Impact Radius is defined as follows:

> *the radius of a circle within which the potential failure of a pipeline could have significant impact on people or property. PIR is*

> *determined by the formula r = 0.69* (square root of ($p*d^2$)), where 'r' is the radius of a circular area in feet surrounding the point of failure, 'p' is the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) in the pipeline segment in pounds per square inch and 'd' is the nominal diameter of the pipeline in inches.*

There is no proposed change to maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) for the MVP Mainline as part of the Project. *See* Resource Report 1 at 1-9 ("Like the existing MVP Mainline, the suction and discharge facilities at the Swann Compressor Station will operate at a maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of 1,480 pounds per square in gauge (psig) and will be constructed in compliance with 49 CFR Part 192 and other applicable standards."). Accordingly, as the MAOP will be the same 1,480 psig as approved by the Commission, there is no change to the calculation of the Potential Impact Radius for the MVP Mainline.

Noise Impacts

Comments regarding the existing noise levels at the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations and potential noise impacts at the Swann Compressor Station are not consistent with observed noise levels at the existing stations or modeling for the new station. In August 2024, MVP submitted noise surveys for the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations (Accession No.20240813-5120). For all three compressor stations, the noise surveys found that the stations were "practically inaudible" at the nearest Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs).

Alternatives

Mr. Zipper claims that MVP failed to fully evaluate the possibility of using electric motor-driven compression at the Swann Compressor Station. In Resource Report 10, MVP explained that the use of electric compression at the Swann Compressor Station would require connection to the 138-kV line, located an approximate straight-line distance of 2.5 miles away to the south of the Swann parcel. Mr. Zipper's comment that "a 138 kv electric powerline is located only about a mile from the presumed and proposed compressor site" is not accurate and is inconsistent with MVP's discussions with AEP about routing. The powerline to the northeast of the Swann Compressor Station site referenced by Mr. Zipper is 2.21 miles away with the optimal routing and would cross the Norfolk Southern railroad tracks twice and also cross Highway 460. MVP fully evaluated the possibility of the use of electric compression at all four compressor station sites.

Mr. Zipper's statements regarding the evaluation of the area's future development potential are similarly unsupported. Resource Report 5 contains a full socioeconomic analysis of the Project area, including the Swann Compressor Station site and Resource Report 10 discusses alternative locations considered. In Resource Report 10, MVP accurately describes the Swann Compressor Station location as primarily low-density residential, forested, and commercial. The MVP-owned parcel was formerly used as a surface/strip mine for shale and/or clay in support of brick manufacturing by the Old Virginia Brick Company in Salem, Virginia. This former heavy industrial use contradicts Mr. Zipper's statements regarding the existing character of the local area.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

General

Question 2

Provide responses to the comments submitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, West Virginia Field Office (FERC accession no. 20251219-5199) and Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation's Division of Natural Heritage (20251219-5327).

Response:

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), West Virginia Field Office, submitted two questions to which MVP has responded below.

1. Regarding the proposed 0.05-acre expansion associated with the existing Harris compressor station, 0.5-acre expansion for the existing Stallworth compressor station, and relocation of blowdown silencers, will any tree clearing occur? If so, how many acres of tree clearing would occur for these proposed activities?

   Response: No tree clearing will occur during construction at the Harris and Stallworth Compressor Stations. *See* Resource Report 3, Section 3.4.3.1.

2. For installation of auxiliary facilities at all three compressor stations: What do "auxiliary facilities" consist of?

   Response: As currently designed, equipment at the stations will include a gas filter, gas coolers, inlet air filters, exhaust catalyst/silencers, condensate and used oil tanks, blowdown silencers, heaters, a transformer, and auxiliary microturbines. Consistent with the cathodic protection at the existing compressor station sites, MVP will install cathodic protection consisting of a deep anode ground bed system along the station perimeter at the Swann Compressor Station.

MVP is currently consulting with the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VADCR) and will file additional information in response to VADCR's comments on the docket by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

General

Question 3

Provide copies of the following cited references for review or provide the applicable accession number if previously filed to FERC's eLibrary.

a. J. T. Boyd. 2024. Surface Subsidence Characterization Bradshaw Compressor Station Harrison County Mine Wetzel County, West Virginia.
b. Tetra Tech. 2025. Addendum Mountain Valley Pipeline – Bradshaw Compressor Station Evaluation of Predicted Movement with Respect to Reinforced Soil Slope (RSS) Wall Mountain Valley Pipeline – Bradshaw Compressor Station Wetzel County, West Virginia.
c. TRC. 2025. Karst Hazard Memo. August 14, 2025.

Response:

MVP hereby provides copies of the listed references as follows:

a. A copy of the surface subsidence characterization study by J.T. Boyd (2024) is provided as Attachment General 3-a (Privileged).

b. The corrected citation for the predicted movement study is:

Tetra Tech. 2024. Addendum Mountain Valley Pipeline – Bradshaw Compressor Station Evaluation of Predicted Movement with Respect to Reinforced Soil Slope (RSS) Wall Mountain Valley Pipeline – Bradshaw Compressor Station Wetzel County, West Virginia.

A copy of this study is provided in Attachment General3- b (Privileged).

c. A copy of the karst hazard memo by TRC (2025) is provided in Attachment General –3-c.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 1

File alignment sheets depicting the following information.

a. compressor station (CS) sites, pig launchers/receivers, mainline valves, and any other aboveground facilities;
b. laydown yards, additional temporary workspaces, pipe storage yards, temporary and permanent access roads in relation to the information requested in (a);
c. outlines of the existing and proposed facility footprint and fenceline, as appropriate;
d. environmental features, including wetlands and waterbodies; and
e. distance of the nearest construction workspace boundary to wetlands and waterbodies.

Response:

MVP is providing alignment sheets depicting the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth Compressor Stations, and their associated access roads and laydown yards, in Attachment 1-1. MVP is in the process of finalizing detailed Swann Compressor Station stormwater management design and will provide a response when any associated revisions to the limits of disturbance have been completed. MVP expects to submit a response for the Swann Compressor Station by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 2

> Provide a schematic/diagram depicting the distance among the Mountain Valley Pipeline mainline, Swann Compressor Station, 42-inch-diameter suction and discharge pipelines, as well as the associated rights-of-way and workspaces, in relation to U.S. Highway 460/11, and Norfolk Southern Railroad. Section 3.2.3 states that "Swann Compressor Station site is located immediately adjacent to the Mountain Valley Pipeline Mainline right-of-way and the suction and discharge facilities associated with the Swann Compressor Station will be located between the Swann Compressor Station and the existing Mountain Valley Pipeline Mainline right-of-way."

Response:

> A schematic/diagram will be submitted to FERC along with the alignment sheets for the Swann Compressor Station (see response to Resource Report 1, Question 1). MVP expects to submit a response by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 3

Provide the following information for the non-jurisdictional transmission powerline for the Swann CS:

a. the length and diameter of the power line to be constructed;
b. land requirements;
c. required permits, including any applicable regulatory siting process; and
d. current 1:24,000/1:25,000 scale topographic maps showing the location of the facilities relative to the proposed jurisdictional facilities.

Response:

The non-jurisdictional transmission powerline will be designed and installed by American Electric Power (AEP). The exact details and location of the utility line are not known at this time.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 4

Clarify the width of the construction workspace for the 0.2-mile 42-inch-diameter dual lay suction and discharge pipelines and provide construction typical diagrams.

Response:

The temporary workspace for the facility pipelines will be 200 feet wide at the tie-in location with the existing MVP Mainline. The workspace will be 125 feet wide from the tie-in to where it transitions into the overall limits of disturbance at the Swann Compressor Station. A construction typical is provided in Attachment 1-4.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 5

> The existing Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor stations range in size from 5.6 to 6.3 acres; however, the Swann Compressor Station is proposed to comprise an operational acreage of approximately 24.7 acres. Provide additional justification for the proposed operational acreage of the Swann Compressor Station.

Response:

> The footprint range of the existing Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations reflects the sizes of the existing compressor station pads in operation at each of these stations. The equivalent size of the compressor station pad at the Swann Compressor Station is similar and is approximately 6 acres. However, in addition to the compressor station pad, the total 24.7-acre operational area for the Swann Compressor Station includes area that will be permanently graded to create the level pad surface, proposed stormwater management features, proposed onsite stockpiles, area for the aboveground and underground electric utility power feed, and modifications to onsite access roads that are needed within the compressor station site boundaries. These additional requirements are either not present at Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations, or are more extensive at the Swann Compressor Station due to its unique site-specific configuration and design.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 6

Provide a more detailed anticipated construction schedule including the start and end dates for discrete phases of construction at each compressor station (including tree clearing) and restoration. Indicate the planned schedule for the construction of the suction/discharge piping at the Swann CS.

Response:

Bradshaw Compressor Station

Construction: Q2 2027 – Q2 2028

Restoration: Q3 2028

Harris Compressor Station

Construction: Q2 2027 – Q2 2028

Restoration: Q3 2028

Stallworth Compressor Station

Construction: Q2 2027 – Q2 2028

Restoration: Q3 2028

Stallworth Compressor Station

Tree clearing: Q4 2026

Station Construction: Q1 2027 – Q2 2028

Suction/Discharge Piping Construction: Q3 2027 – Q4 2027

Restoration: Q2 2028-Q3 2028

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 7

Identify any proposed sewer and water services that would be installed/upgraded in association with the Project, and provide the following detailed information for each non-jurisdictional facility:

a. company/owner;
b. type of facility;
c. dimensions (pipe diameter, length, horsepower, etc. as appropriate for pipeline and land area for other facilities);
d. an impacts discussion, including acreage of land use and vegetation impacts, if applicable; and
e. maps showing locations.

Response:

No water or sewer services will be installed or upgraded in association with the Project.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 8

> Section 9.2.5.1 indicates construction would occur "six days per week from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, or daylight hours." Additionally, Mountain Valley stated it would possibly conduct construction activities past 7:00 pm during spring, summer, and fall when daylight hours could occur past 7:00 pm. Identify the specific days of the week of construction. Indicate if construction would take place on Sundays, federal holidays, or during nighttime hours. If nighttime work would occur, provide a detailed list of all activities that may occur during nighttime hours.

Response:

> MVP will conduct construction activities six days per week (typically Monday-Saturday). Work may occur on Sundays or holidays if five or fewer days were worked the previous week due to extenuating circumstances, such as weather. Construction activities will typically be conducted during daylight hours except activities that would require around-the-clock operations, which include hydrostatic testing and subsequent pig runs to clean and dry the pipe, as well as tie-in welds. In spring, summer, and fall, when sunset occurs later in the evening, construction activities may continue after 7:00 p.m. but will be limited to daylight hours.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 9

> For trees and brush cleared, identify how Mountain Valley would dispose of the timber and slash in accordance with section III.E of our *Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan*.

Response:

> MVP owns the property where timber and brush will be cut. If space allows, MVP will stack the material on site. However, if necessary, timber and slash will be hauled off to an approved disposal site. For any brush disposal on property that is not owned by MVP, a method of disposal will be included as part of the land agreement.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 10

> Clarify why blasting may be needed for proposed modifications at Harris Compressor Station.

Response:

> During initial construction of the Harris Compressor Station, hard rock was encountered at shallow depths. As the proposed equipment will be installed in areas known to have hard rock at shallow depths, blasting may be required to facilitate excavation for trenches or foundations.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 11

Provide a description of the current use of the Bradshaw Compressor Station Laydown Yard (MVP-LY-001).

Response:

MVP-LY-001 is currently being used for equipment storage by a third-party company that is not affiliated with MVP.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 12

Provide an updated table 1.7-1 (Agencies with Relevant Permit or Consultation Requirements). Provide any additional agency correspondence not previously filed with the Commission. Records of communication must show both directions of correspondence (i.e., what information was sent to the agency and the agency's response). Clearly identify which agency-recommended mitigation measures Mountain Valley would and would not adopt.

Response:

An updated Table 1.7-1 is provided as Attachment 1-12. MVP does not have any additional agency correspondence not previously filed with the Commission, except as provided in Resource Report 4 Question 2 and Resource Report 2 Question 2. A summary of agency-recommended mitigation measures is provided in Table 9-9.

Table 9-9
Summary of Agency-Recommended Mitigation Measures

Agency	Date	Measure	MVP Response
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	August 5, 2025	All circumstances where the project will impact transportation operations should be coordinated with the VDOT Christiansburg Residency prior to construction.	MVP will comply with measure as stated.
		Activities requiring detours or other modifications to transportation operations should be conducted at times during which impacts will be minimized.	MVP will comply with measure as stated.
		Road signs should be provided to alert drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians of utility and construction work ahead, and any detours necessary to navigate around the utility work.	MVP will comply with measure as stated.

Table 9-9
Summary of Agency-Recommended Mitigation Measures

Agency	Date	Measure	MVP Response
Virginia Department of Health	August 22, 2025	Best Management Practices should be employed, including Erosion & Sedimentation Controls and Spill Prevention Controls & Countermeasures on the project site.	MVP will implement erosion and sedimentation controls and a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan (see Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.6 and Appendix 2-A2)
		Materials should be managed while on site and during transport to prevent impacts to nearby surface water.	MVP will implement a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan to manage materials on site and during transport (see Resource Report 2, Appendix 2-A2)
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	September 5, 2025	To minimize adverse impacts to the aquatic ecosystem as a result of the proposed activities, DCR recommends the implementation of and strict adherence to applicable state and local erosion and sediment control/storm water management laws and regulations.	MVP will implement erosion and sedimentation control and stormwater management in accordance with state and local requirements.
		During every phase of the project, DCR recommends stabilization of the soil around the site. Minimizing surface disturbance, strict use of E&S control measures appropriate for the location and adherence to best management practices appropriate for karst will help to reduce any potential impact to the karst, groundwater and surface water resources as well as any associated fauna and flora.	MVP will implement its Project-specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (see Resource Report 2, Section 2.2.3). Karst is not anticipated to occur as the Project area is not underlain by karst-forming rock types (see Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.2).
		If karst features such as sinkholes, caves, disappearing streams, and large springs are encountered during the project, please coordinate with Wil Orndorff (540-230-5960, Wil.Orndorff@dcr.virginia.gov) the Virginia DCR, Division of Natural Heritage Karst Protection Coordinator, to document and minimize adverse impacts.	Karst is not anticipated to occur as the Project area is not underlain by karst-forming rock types (see Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.2).

Table 9-9
Summary of Agency-Recommended Mitigation Measures

Agency	Date	Measure	MVP Response
		If the project involves filling or "improvement" of sinkholes or cave openings, DCR would like detailed location information and copies of the design specifications. In cases where sinkhole improvement is for storm water discharge, copies of VDOT Form EQ-120 will suffice.	Karst is not anticipated to occur as the Project area is not underlain by karst-forming rock types (see Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.2).

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 13

> Identify all permits that are necessary regarding impacts on Waters of the U.S., including all permits required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the state/certifying authority under Section 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act. Specify the process and requirements for receiving a Water Quality Certification, the application date, and the most recent status of each permit. File all correspondence and permit applications on the FERC docket. Confirm that all discharges (as defined under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act) to Waters of the U.S., have been accounted for.

Response:

> Coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, has been completed, including issuance of Preliminary and Approved Jurisdictional Determinations indicating that no permit is required for any of the Project Areas in West Virginia. This documentation, along with the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection's determination that a State Waters Permit is not required, was filed to the docket under Accession No. 20260107-5071.
>
> MVP is currently consulting with the appropriate agencies in Virginia and additional information will be filed on the docket as it becomes available.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 14

> File an updated list of affected landowners based on returned mailings or other new information. Landowner mailing lists should be filed as "Privileged" and as an Excel file (.xlsx).

Response:

> MVP is filing an updated list of affected landowners in Attachment 1-14 (Privileged).

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 15

> As applicable, provide the specific acreage of environmentally sensitive resources affected for the projects in table 1.10-2. Also, submit a figure with USGS Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 12 watersheds delineated and projects with potential cumulative effects depicted in relation to the Project facilities.

Response:

> A figure of projects listed in Table 1.10-2, with United States Geological Survey (USGS) HUC 12 watersheds, is provided in Attachment 1-15. Specific acreage of environmentally sensitive resources affected is provided in Table 1.10-2 to the extent that information is publicly available. An updated Table 1.10-2 is provided in Attachment 1-16.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 1

Question 16

Update table 1.10-2 (Projects with Potential Cumulative Impacts) to reflect the following revised geographic scopes:

- Land Use: 1-mile radius of the Project construction area
- Visual Resources: viewshed for all Compressor Stations
- Air Quality – Construction: 0.5 mile from aboveground facilities
- Air Quality – Operation: 20 kilometers from Title V sources (Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs) and 5 km from minor sources (Swann CS); or the significant impact area (as listed in the air modeling analyses in table 2-2 in appendix 9-C, 9-D, 9-E, and 9-F), whichever is greater
- Noise – Construction: 0.5 mile from construction work areas
- Noise – Operation: other facilities that would affect any noise sensitive areas (NSA) within 1 mile of the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth, and Swann CSs.

Response:

MVP is providing updated Table 1.10-1 and 1.10-2 in Attachment 1-16 to reflect the revised geographic scopes. The significant impact areas (SIA) for the Bradshaw and Stallworth Compressor Stations are less than 20 kilometers, and the SIA for the Swann Compressor Station is less than 5 kilometers; therefore, 20 kilometers was used for the air quality geographic scope for operation for those Title V sources and 5 kilometers was used for the Swann Compressor Station. The 1-hour SIA for the Harris Compressor Station for NO_2 is 20.99 km (see Resource Report 9 Question 7); therefore, this distance was used for the air quality geographic scope for operation of the Harris Compressor Station.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 1

> Section 2.1.3 states that water supply wells owned by Mountain Valley are present in the Project area serving the existing Bradshaw and Harris Compressor Stations. Clarify how Mountain Valley would protect surface completions of water supply wells within the construction workspace from physical damage.

Response:

> Water wells at MVP's existing compressor stations are non-potable water supply. MVP's existing wells will be protected in accordance with MVP's Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan (Resource Report 2, Appendix 2-A1). Blasting activities at the existing Harris Compressor Station, if required, will be sufficiently distant from the location of existing water supply well to avoid damage. Site-specific protection of facilities during blasting activities will be furthered by implementation of the contractor's detailed blasting plan, which will be prepared consistent with MVP's general Blasting Plan (Resource Report 6, Appendix 6-A) for any blasting activities. All water wells will be protected with a protective barrier prior to construction,

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 2

The sources that Mountain Valley cites that it consulted to identify wellhead protection areas crossed by the Project (i.e., the Virginia Department of Health's [VDH] mapping of Surface Water Zone 2 Source Water Protection Areas and an informational webpage from West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources [WVDHHR]) do not appear to include information on the location of wellhead protection areas. Therefore, consult with the VDH, WVDHHR, and/or county administrators regarding the presence/absence of wellhead protection areas crossed by the Project and supplemental mitigation measures for any crossed.

Response:

In West Virginia, the West Virginia Bureau of Public Health Source Water Assessment and Protection Program covers both surface water and wellhead protection. The West Virginia Source Water Protection Map Viewer (WVDHHR 2026) includes source water protection areas for public water supplies in West Virginia, including delineated Wellhead Protection Areas. According to this dataset the closest delineated Wellhead Protection Area is located approximately 2 miles east of existing Stallworth Compressor Station (WV9913122).

In Virginia, publicly available data is limited to Source Water Protection Areas related to surface water intakes, as mapped by Virginia Department of Health (VDH). MVP sent an introductory letter to Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) Water Division on August 1, 2025, for information on resources that may be impacted by the project. VDEQ consulted with VDH, and VDH provided a response with comments regarding the proximity of the Project to public drinking water sources (groundwater wells, springs, and surface water intakes). Although the response from VDH did not identify Wellhead Protection Area information, no groundwater wells were identified in the response.

Wellhead Protection Plans in Virginia are implemented at the local level and VDH and VDEQ have collaborated on a Source Water Implementation Grant Program, which provides grant opportunities for local wellhead protection implementation projects Municipal recipients since the grant programs inception are available on VDH website and include projects in Accomack, James City, Augusta County, Fauquier, Loudoun, and

Rockingham County. None of the projects are identified within Montgomery County (VDH 2026). Montgomery County is also part of the area under the New River Valley Planning District. At the time of the regional New River Valley Water Supply Plan (2011), there were no wellhead protection programs in the district.

Based on available information, MVP does not anticipate any wellhead protection areas are crossed by the Project and therefore, supplemental mitigation measures are not required. MVP conducted additional consultation with the VDH to confirm if there are any wellhead protection areas in their records that may overlap the Project area, but VDH has confirmed their records do not have additional information (Attachment 2-2). MVP will also coordinate with Montgomery County Public Service Authority and will request information on local wellhead protection areas. MVP expects to provide an additional response by March 20, 2026.

References:

New River Valley Planning District Commission. 2011. New River Valley Water Supply Plan. Available online at: https://nrvrc.org/images/pdf/NRV-Water-Supply-Plan-2011.pdf. Accessed February 6, 2026.

VDOH. 2026. Source Water Protection Assistance & Funding Opportunities. Available at: https://www.vdh.virginia.gov/drinking-water/source-water-programs/source-water-protection-assistance-funding-opportunities/. Accessed February 4, 2026.

WVDHHR. 2026. West Virginia Source Water Protection Map Viewer. Available at: https://oehsportal.wvdhhr.org/wvswap/. Accessed February 4, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 3

> Section 2.2.3.3 states that there are no impaired waterbodies within the Project area, while section 3.1.2 states that there are no identified perennial or intermittent surface waters within the Project area. Clarify the geographic scope for "Project area."

Response:

> The Project area is defined in Resource Report 2 to be the limits of disturbance for construction at the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth, and Swann Compressor Station sites, including ancillary facilities and offsite laydown yards. As described in Section 2.2.3 and identified in Table 2.2-3, the only surface water features delineated in the Project area are ephemeral drainages that do not flow into downstream waters; these drainages are not perennial or intermittent surface waters and are not classified as impaired waterbodies.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 4

> Provide the distance between the nearest construction workspace to the South Fork Roanoke River.

Response:

> The nearest construction workspace at the Swann Compressor Station is 417 feet from the South Fork Roanoke River.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 5

Explain the transport of hydrostatic test water from water hydrants for the proposed Swann Compressor Station (e.g., permit requirements, vehicles, number of trips).

Response:

Hydrostatic test water for the Swann suction and discharge facilities will be obtained from either a Western Virginia Water Authority hydrant located approximately one mile northeast of the proposed Swann Compressor Station site, or a Montgomery County Water Department hydrant located approximately 0.4 mile northwest of the site. Water will be transported to the test location by highway-legal water trucks, which hold approximately 4,000 to 5,000 gallons of water. To supply the 120,000 gallons of water needed for testing, approximately 30 truck trips to the site will be required, depending on actual truck capacity and operation constraints. MVP will comply with all applicable roadway and permitting requirements.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 6

Provide discharge locations for hydrostatic test water at the proposed Swann Compressor Station.

Response:

Hydrostatic test water will be discharged via an energy-dissipating dewatering structure to a well-vegetated upland area within or adjacent to the Swann Compressor Station construction workspace, in compliance with local erosion and sediment control requirements and, as necessary, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit conditions. There will be no direct discharge to streams or wetlands. Exact locations for discharge will be determined upon the finalization of the Swann Compressor Station design.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 2

Question 7

> Clarify if all freshwater used for Project activities (e.g., hydrostatic testing, dust suppression, cement mixing) in West Virginia and Virginia would be from municipal sources.

Response:

> All freshwater used for Project activities will be from municipal sources.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 1

> Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VA DCR) indicated several natural heritage resources are in the Project area. Provide a discussion on state-protected species and natural heritage resources. Specify which recommendations Mountain Valley would or would not adopt, including explicit addressal for the Roanoke River – North and South Forks Stream Conservation Site and spatulate snowfly.

Response:

> Please refer to MVP's response to General Question 2.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 2

> Bradshaw Compressor Station's laydown yard (MVP-LY-001) is within 50 feet of South Fork Fishing Creek. Therefore, elaborate on any additional or Project-specific mitigation procedures to minimize the effects of the use of the laydown yard on water quality, fisheries, and potential occurrence of listed species in South Fork Fishing Creek. As available, submit the Project-specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, including mitigation procedures for severe weather events.

Response:

> MVP will place necessary erosion and sediment controls to protect the existing wetlands and South Fork of Fishing Creek. Considering the current industrial use of this site, it is not anticipated that any additional earth disturbance will need to occur. Therefore, no impact to South Fork Fishing Creek or the existing wetlands is anticipated to occur. MVP will provide site-specific erosion and sediment control plans when available.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 3

> Section 3.2.3 states that "[a]pproximately 13.8 acres of deciduous forested land will be cleared as part of the construction and operation of the Swann Compressor Station" and "[t]here is no forested vegetation within the temporary workspace for the Swann Compressor Station or at the laydown yards." Clarify.

Response:

> Temporary workspace refers to the area that will only be used temporarily and will be allowed to return to its previous land use following construction of the Project. However, portions of the operational area of the Swann Compressor Station site will also be used to support construction activities; some of that area supporting both construction and operation of the Swann Compressor Station is forested. MVP is in the process of finalizing the detailed Swann Compressor Station stormwater management design and will provide an additional response regarding forested land when any associated revisions to the limits of disturbance have been completed. MVP expects to submit a response by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 4

Section 3.2.2.8 states that "one Environmental Inspector (EI) per state who is adequately trained in field identification of highly noxious invasive plant species and will ensure equipment is free of debris before being transported to a new construction site through use of designated equipment cleaning stations to minimize the spread of non-native vegetation." Discuss which equipment would be transported among facilities in West Virginia and Virginia. Also, elaborate on the meaning of "highly noxious invasive plant species" given the differential threat evaluations noted in table 3.2-2.

Response:

MVP does not anticipate transporting equipment between the compressor station facilities. Contractors are required to thoroughly clean all construction equipment, such as with high-pressure washing, prior to moving the equipment to the Project area, in order to limit the potential for the spread of noxious weeds, insects, or other soil-borne pests.

"Highly noxious invasive plant species" refers to "Highly Invasive" plants identified by West Virginia Department of Natural Resources (WVDNR 2025) and species of "High" invasiveness as listed by Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (Heffernan et al. 2024), which are listed together under the category of "highly invasive plant species" in Table 3.2-2.

References:

Heffernan, K., E. Engle, C. Richardson. 2024. Virginia Invasive Plant Species List. Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Division of Natural Heritage, Richmond.

WVDNR. 2025. Invasive Plant Species of West Virginia. Available at: https://wvdnr.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/WV-Priority-Invasive-Plants-List-2025.pdf. Accessed February 9, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 5

> Provide the tree clearing window for the Project to minimize and avoid impacts on migratory birds and listed species. Section 3.3.2 states that "Mountain Valley plans to conduct tree clearing between April 1 – November 15 (see Section 3.4.3.3), which avoids potential impacts during the nesting season for most migratory birds (April 1 to August 31)." Clarify this discrepancy.

Response:

> The statement in Section 3.3.2 is incorrect. MVP does not plan to conduct tree clearing between April 1 and November 15. The statement in Section 3.3.2 should read "MVP does not plan to conduct tree clearing between April 1 and November 15 (see Section 3.4.3.3), which avoids potential impacts during the nesting season for most migratory birds (April 1 – August 31)."

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 6

Clarify whether field assessments for noxious and invasive species of the Project facilities, particularly at Swann Compressor Station, were conducted.

Response:

As the Project area consists almost entirely of previously disturbed area, field assessments for noxious and invasive species have not been conducted for the Project.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 7

> For the Swann Compressor Station, discuss whether a habitat survey was conducted (i.e., identification of suitable roost trees, foraging habitat) for four bat species: endangered Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, and gray bat, and proposed endangered tricolored bat.

Response:

> A formal habitat survey for Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, gray bat, and tricolored bat has not been conducted at the Swann Compressor Station site. Vegetation within the forested portions of the site during field reconnaissance was characterized as primarily early to mid-successional mixed upland hardwood. No cave, karst, or anthropogenic features (e.g., culverts, bridges, or other structures) that could be utilized as roosting structures were identified within the Project area.
>
> Based on a review of the USFWS IPaC online tool for determining species presence, gray bats are not known to occur within the Swann Compressor Station area.
>
> MVP is currently coordinating with the USFWS Virginia Field Office and the Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources regarding potential effects of the Project on Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, and tricolored bat. A Biological Assessment evaluating potential impacts to these species is being prepared and is anticipated to be filed to the docket by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 8

> In section 3.4.3.1, Mountain Valley stated that "[t]ime-of-year restrictions apply only to tricolored bats, as they are the only bat species known to occur in relevant proximity to the Swann Compressor Station where tree clearing will take place." Provide details on the timing of tree and vegetation removal during construction relative to the nesting season for migratory birds, including Birds of Conservation Concern, and bald and golden eagles.

Response:

> MVP does not plan to conduct tree clearing between April 1 and November 15, which avoids potential impacts during the nesting season for migratory birds (April 1 – August 31).

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 9

> Section 3.4.3.1 addresses lighting effects on federally listed bats and proposed bat species. Similarly, elaborate on impacts from construction and operational lighting at aboveground facilities on Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC), especially those that are nighttime migrants, and discuss specific measures to minimize impacts.

Response:

> MVP is in the process of preparing a Biological Assessment, which will address potential lighting effects at aboveground facilities. MVP expects to submit the Biological Assessment by March 20, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 3

Question 10

> As applicable, submit any correspondence with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which was not previously submitted. Records of communication must show both directions of correspondence (i.e., what information was sent to the agency and the agency's response). Provide an update on the Section 7 Endangered Species Act consultation process, including effects determinations for listed and proposed species, and as appropriate, submit species-specific determination keys.

Response:

> MVP expects to submit a Biological Assessment by March 20, 2026. At this time, there is no additional correspondence that was not previously submitted.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 4

Question 1

> Within the Plan for the Unanticipated Discovery of Historic Properties and Human Remains, please add the FERC contact as Archaeologist Allison King (202-502-8847).

Response:

> A revised copy of the Plan for the Unanticipated Discovery of Historic Properties and Human Remains is provided as Attachment 4-1.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 4

Question 2

> Provide any previously unfiled cultural resource reports and correspondence with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), including the SHPO's comments on the *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Swann Compressor Station for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Boost Project in Montgomery County, Virginia*.

Response:

> Additional correspondence with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), including the SHPO's comments on the *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the Swann Compressor Station for the Mountain Valley Pipeline Boost Project in Montgomery County, Virginia,* is provided as Attachment 4-2.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 5

Question 1

Provide an estimate of the total number of average daily and peak daily round trips, including construction related deliveries, generated by construction activities at each aboveground facility and contractor/laydown yard.

Response:

An estimated average of 75 daily round trips for construction activities is expected at each existing aboveground facility and associated laydown yards. This daily average includes commuting by site workers and construction-related deliveries. A peak of 100 daily round trips for construction activities is estimated at each of the existing aboveground facilities and associated laydown yards. An estimated average of 95 daily round trips for construction activities is expected at the Swann Compressor Station and its associated laydown yard, with the peak estimated to be approximately 120 daily round trips.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 5

Question 2

Evaluate the level of service/capacity impacts for construction and operational activities at each compressor station site. Include an analysis of cumulative impacts on traffic in this evaluation.

Response:

Average and peak daily round trips for each compressor station site are addressed in Resource Report 5 Question 1. At each of the existing compressor station sites in West Virginia, the peak and average daily round trips for construction the MVP Boost Project are anticipated to be significantly lower than the number of trips for original construction of these compressor stations as part of the MVP Mainline. Given that Project access to these compressor stations will be the same as for the MVP Mainline construction, MVP does not anticipate any additional impacts to level of service or capacity. No additional trips are anticipated during operations of the West Virginia compressor stations as a result of the Project; therefore, the Project will not affect existing traffic during operations.

Section 5.2.5 of Resource Report 5 provides existing traffic count data for the vicinity of each of the Project compressor station sites. At the Swann Compressor Station, MVP anticipates a daily average of 95 round trips and a peak of 120 round trips for construction activities, which represents a relatively small percentage of the Average Daily Traffic volume of 9,800 vehicles (VDOT 2025) for the portion of U.S. 460/11 that would provide access to the compressor station site. The VDOT provided comments on the Project in correspondence dated August 5, 2025 (see response to Resource Report 1, Question 12 above).

MVP will coordinate with the West Virginia Division of Highways (WVDOH) and VDOT on any applicable permits. MVP will manage traffic in accordance with those permits and the Traffic and Transportation Management Plan, Section 2.0, that was submitted as Appendix 5-B of Resource Report 5.

Reference:

VDOT (Virginia Department of Transportation). 2025. Traffic Counts. Available online at: https://www.vdot.virginia.gov/doing-business/technical-guidance-and-support/trafficoperations/traffic-counts/.

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 5

Question 3

> Given the proximity (<500 feet) of the Bradshaw Compressor Station Laydown Yard (MVP-LY-001) to the Martyn Early Learning Center and the fact that they share an access road (Greenwood Road), describe measures that would be taken to prevent or minimize traffic disruptions.

Response:

> MVP-LY-001 was used during the construction of MVP Mainline. As described above in the response to Resource Report 1 Question 4, it continues to be used for equipment storage by a third-party company at this time. MVP plans to use the same yard for the MVP Boost Project, MVP will implement its Traffic and Transportation Management Plan (Appendix 5-B of Resource Report 5), which is based on the plan that was implemented during construction of the MVP Mainline.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 5

Question 4

Based on comments received on the Project docket (accession numbers 20251126-5309 and 20251219-5549) regarding the project's impact on property values, provide an assessment that addresses concerns about the proposed project causing a decrease in property values and support your conclusions with reference to existing studies and data to the extent possible.

Response:

A comprehensive report completed by Integra Realty Resources for the INGAA Foundation (INGAA Foundation 2016) concluded there is no measurable impact on the sales price of or the demand for properties located along or near a natural gas pipeline compared to properties that are not.

The 2016 INGAA Foundation study reviewed underground FERC-regulated natural gas transmission pipelines in residential areas in the Midwest, Northeast, Mid-Atlantic and Southeast. In addition, a study by Gnarus Advisors LLC (2012) examined whether proximity to pipelines, with a focus on natural gas pipelines, has an effect on residential property values. The study contains a literature review specific to pipelines and property values, with a focus on actual sales data. The authors conclude that there is "no credible evidence based on actual sales data that proximity to pipelines reduces property values." Further, they found that "hypothetical surveys of actual or potential market participants should not be used as a substitute for the systematic analysis of market data, as they may overstate the effects, if any, of proximity to disamenities, including pipelines, on property values."

References:

Gnarus Advisors LLC. 2012. Pipelines and Property Values: An Eclectic Review of the Literature. Available online at: https://pstrust.org/docs/Gnarus_Pipelines_Property_Values.pdf. Accessed on February 10, 2026.

INGAA Foundation. 2016. Pipeline Impact to Property Value and Property Insurability. Available online at: https://ingaa.org/foundation/resources/pipeline-impact-to-property-value-and-property-insurability/. Accessed on February 10, 2026.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 6

Question 1

Confirm that the Harrison County Mine is the only subsurface coal mine within 0.25 mile of any Project area or identify any such mine, including distance from the nearest Project facility and mine status (e.g., active, abandoned).

Response:

The Harrison County Mine is the only subsurface coal mine within 0.25 mile of the Project, based on available data on active West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) mining permits (WVDEP 2026), Underground Mining Limits (WVGES 2023) and GIS data from the Virginia Department of Energy (VDE 2024 and 2026). Mapping provided in Attachment 6-1 depicts the closest coal mines to the Project, with 0.25-mile and 0.5-mile buffers.

References:

WVDEP (West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection). 2026. Permit Search: Search Mining Permits and Applications. Available online at: https://dep.wv.gov/dmr/Pages/PermitSearch.aspx. Accessed February 4, 2026.

WVGES (West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey). 2023. Underground Mining Limits GIS data. Available online at: https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=f4db4f7d83404eda97556a1df999f207. Accessed February 4, 2026.

VDE (Virginia Department of Energy). 2024. Metals & Industrial Minerals Mining in Virginia. Available online at: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/9783624682d441d48f55f9bc66b713f8/. Accessed February 4, 2026.

VDE. 2026. Mineral Mining, GIS data. Available online at: https://energy.virginia.gov/webmaps/MineralMining/. Accessed February 4, 2026.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 6

Question 2

Clarify specific measures or design criteria that would be adopted by Mountain Valley to meet standards under U.S. Department of Transportation Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 192, the American Society of Civil Engineers, American Society for Mechanical Engineers, and/or American National Standards Institute to protect its proposed facilities from seismic hazards.

Response:

MVP will meet the requirements of U.S. Department of Transportation Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 192 by designing and constructing its facilities to withstand reasonably anticipated outside forces, including seismic ground shaking. Seismic design for the Project is based on USGS probabilistic seismic hazard analyses, including peak ground acceleration values associated with a 2 percent probability of exceedance over a 50-year period. Buildings and foundations that house or support regulated pipeline facilities are designed in accordance with ASCE 7 (*Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures*), with structural concrete and steel designed in accordance with ACI 318 and AISC 360, respectively, to accommodate site-specific seismic demands. Regional and site-specific seismicity, including historic earthquakes and potential faulting, has been evaluated, and the Project area is not located above faults with evidence of Quaternary movement; therefore, the potential for permanent ground deformation from fault rupture is negligible. Site-specific geotechnical investigations indicate a low potential for soil liquefaction and lateral spreading, and these conditions are incorporated into facility and foundation design, thereby minimizing seismic risk to the facilities.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 6

Question 3

> Section 6.6.1.2 states that Mountain Valley would return "contours to pre-construction conditions to the extent practicable, except where modification of contours is necessary to stabilize slopes, in any temporary workspaces outside of the final grade of compressor station sites." Clarify the locations where temporary workspaces would not be restored to approximate pre-construction contours as well as how the appearance of these slopes may be modified (i.e., describe plans for post-construction grading and any aboveground slope stabilization features.

Response:

> At this time, MVP intends to restore all temporary workspaces to pre-construction contours the greatest extent practicable. If a situation should occur where pre-construction contours could not be restored, MVP will coordinate with FERC and any other applicable agency.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 6

Question 4

> Given topography and landslide susceptibility near existing compressor stations, clarify to what extent Project ground disturbance would occur in areas that have not been previously graded.

Response:

> With the exception of Swann Compressor Station, no disturbance is anticipated outside of previously graded areas.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 6

Question 5

Address the following regarding landslide hazards, and steep and unstable slopes:

a. provide general guidelines, construction typicals, and/or site-specific plans describing how Mountain Valley would manage surface and groundwater to avoid water saturation of soils during construction and operation, including, for example the use of non-native backfill, slope and trench breakers, groundwater interceptor drains, and other measures to stabilize the slopes or divert water away from the right-of-way;
b. how construction spoils, snow, and cleared brush and timber would be managed to prevent overweighing unstable slopes and triggering landslides; and
c. provide site-specific restoration plans for slopes that cannot be restored to pre-construction background conditions.

Response:

a. As no bulk earthwork is planned at Bradshaw, Harris, or Stallworth Compressor Stations, slopes are anticipated to remain stable. At Swann Compressor Station, slopes and stormwater/groundwater will be managed per the best management practices (BMPs) in the design drawings, which are anticipated to be submitted by March 20, 2026.
b. Construction spoils, snow, and cleared brush and timber will be stored on-site at approved locations or hauled offsite to an appropriate facility.
c. The only slopes that are not anticipated to be restored to pre-construction contours are those at the Swann Compressor Station site. Restoration plans for Swann Compressor Station will be addressed in the site design drawings.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 8

Question 1

For the Swann CS site, identify whether Mountain Valley presently owns the property, or the status of negotiations with landowners to acquire/lease the property.

Response:

MVP presently owns the property for the proposed Swann Compressor Station.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 8

Question 2

> Given the proximity of the Swann CS to multiple natural, recreational, and scenic areas as indicated in Section 8.4.2, provide a description of any measures, if any, would be employed at the Swann CS to mitigate visual impacts.

Response:

> MVP conducted a viewshed analysis for the proposed Swann Compressor Station, which incorporated a Digital Surface Model that accounted for height of the proposed facilities above the proposed site elevation, elevation of surrounding landform (topography), and presence and height of vegetation that would remain surrounding the proposed compressor station. The viewshed analysis indicates the compressor station would be visible from areas to the northeast of the site primally along the U.S. Route 460/11 corridor (the area marked as "Potential Visibility" on Figure 8.4-1 of Resource Report 8). As shown on Figure 8.4-1, the viewshed analysis indicates the proposed compressor station would not be visible from any of the natural, recreational, and scenic areas described in Section 8.4.2 due to natural screening from intervening vegetation and landform. Therefore, MVP is not proposing any measures to mitigate visual impacts.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 1

> Table 9.1-11 indicated that there would not be any on-road vehicle travel emissions associated with construction activities at the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs. On-road vehicle travel emissions should include delivery vehicles, worker commuting vehicles, etc. Provide an updated table 9.1-11 to include this information.

Response:

> MVP is providing updated Tables 9.1-11 and 9.1-12 in Attachment 9-1.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 2

Provide the air modeling input and output files for all the compressor stations per the guidance provided in appendix A.

Response:

MVP is providing the input and output files for the compressor stations to FERC via email with this response, due to file format of the modeling files.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 3

> The air dispersion modeling summaries in appendices 9-C, 9-D, and 9-E shows differences in the values provided for the "facility total" and "project" concentrations for some criteria pollutants between the significant impacts analyses (SIA) (table 2-2) and maximum concentration analyses (table 2-3) for the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs. Clarify whether the maximum value (highest first high) was used for each criteria pollutant and averaging period for the SIAs for the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth, and Swann CSs.

Response:

> The maximum value (highest first high) was used for the significant impact analyses in Table 2-2 of Appendices 9-C, 9-D, and 9-E of Resource Report 9. The results in Table 2-3 of each appendix corresponded to the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) standard, depending on the pollutant and averaging period.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 4

Provide a narrative that explains the modeling tables and well as clarification for the following regarding the air dispersion modeling analyses:

a. Clarify whether the significant impact levels (SIL) for 1-hour SO2 was exceeded at the Stallworth CS as indicated in the text on page 2-12 of appendix 9-E;
b. Clarify whether "facility total" includes background sources, existing sources, and/or proposed sources for table 2-2 in appendices 9-C, 9-D, and 9-E for the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs, respectively.
c. Clarify the difference between the "facility total" and "project" columns in table 2-2 in appendices 9-C, 9-D, and 9-E. It appears that the "facility total" was used as the comparison for the significant impact levels; indicate why these values were used.

Response:

a. Table 2-2 in each appendix (9-C, 9-D, and 9-E of Resource Report 9) contains a comparison of the modeled results against the significant impact level (SIL). For comparison against the SIL, the high first high was selected. The "facility total" column represents the modeled concentrations from both the existing sources and the proposed sources. The "project" column represents the modeled concentrations from the proposed sources alone.

   Table 2-3 in each appendix contains a comparison of the modeled results against the NAAQS. For comparison against the NAAQS, the form of the standard (e.g., high second high for 1-hr CO) was selected. The "facility" column represents the modeled concentrations from both the existing sources and the proposed sources. The "project" column represents the modeled concentrations from the proposed sources alone. The "facility total" column represents the modeled concentrations from both the existing sources and the proposed sources, plus background. The "project total" column represents the modeled concentrations from the proposed sources alone, plus background.

   The text is incorrect. The 1-hour SO_2 SIL was not exceeded.

b. The "facility total" in Table 2-2 includes both the existing sources and the proposed sources.

c. The "facility total" column in Table 2-2 includes both the existing sources and the proposed sources, while the "project" column in Table 2-2 includes just the proposed sources. The comparison to the SIL was performed using the "facility total" column as a conservative comparison.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 5

> In table 2-3 in appendices 9-D and 9-E, it appears that the sum of the "facility," "project," and "background," exceeds the SIL and the NAAQS for annual PM2.5 at the Harris CS and 1-hour NO2 at the Stallworth CS. Therefore, provide clarification regarding the statements in appendices 9-D and 9-E indicating that the "maximum cumulative impacts from operation of the compressor stations are not anticipated to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS for any pollutant or averaging period". Explain this discrepancy and clarify whether there are NAAQS exceedances from the Harris CS and Stallworth CS. If so, indicate any mitigation Mountain Valley would implement to reduce the concentrations of these pollutants to below the NAAQs.

Response:

> Similar to Table 2-2 in each appendix, the "facility" column in Table 2-3 in Appendices 9-D and 9-E of Resource Report 9 includes both new and existing sources. The "Facility Total" column is the sum of the facility sources (new and existing) and background concentration. The "Project Total" column is the sum of Project sources and background. Separate comparisons were made to help evaluate the Project by itself and the cumulative impact of the facility, post-Project.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 6

> There appear to be differences between the air dispersion modeling provided in the Mountain Valley Pipeline Project Application (CP16-10) as disclosed in the final Environmental Impact Statement (FERC accession number 20170623-4000), and the "existing sources" modeled in tables 2-2 and 2-3 in appendix 9-C, 9-D, and 9-E for the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs. Provide a description of what changes have been made at the existing CSs that could result in these differences.

Response:

> There are several factors that may lead to different model results. AERMOD and other supporting models (e.g., AERMET) have been updated since that time. Updated meteorological data was also used for this analysis (calendar years 2020-2024). Additionally, the current model represents as-built conditions for the existing compressor stations while the previous modeling was based on design parameters. As such, source parameters (e.g., height, flow, temperature) may have changed from the original analysis. During review, it was noted that the Solar turbine velocities for the Harris and Bradshaw Compressor Stations in the Table A-2 in the respective modeling report were incorrect. An updated table for each station is included in Attachment 9-6.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 7

> It appears that the sum of the "facility" and "background" and the sum of the "project" and "background" columns do not match what was provided in the "facility total" and "project total" columns, respectively, for the maximum impact analysis for the Harris CS (table 2-3 in appendix 9-D) and Stallworth CS (table 2-3 in appendix 9-E). Provide a description of the inputs for the "facility total" and "project total" columns and clarify these apparent discrepancies.

Response:

> Table 2-3 of each appendix includes both new and existing sources. The "Facility Total" column is the sum of the facility sources (new and existing) and background concentration. The "Project Total" column is the sum of project sources and background. Separate comparisons were made to help evaluate the project by itself and the cumulative impact of the facility, post project. Revised tables have been included in Attachment 9-7 to correct the discrepancies noted. The revised tables also include updated table column headings for clarity and model results with the velocity updates noted in Resource Report 9 Question 6.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 8

> There appears to be a residential structure less than 500 feet west from the Swann CS property line as indicated in figure B-1 of appendix 9-J. Clarify whether this structure is an active noise sensitive area. If so, provide an updated ambient noise survey and projected construction and operational noise levels to include this residence.

Response:

> The residential structure was assumed to be vacant; however, it was decided that the conservative approach was to add this in the analysis as NSA-6 at Swann Compressor Station. The sound profiles shown on Figure B-2 and B-3 in Resource Report 9 show that this structure is under the 48.6 A-weighted decibels (dBA) continuous sounds pressure limit post-Project and will not pose a noise concern. Tables 9.2-8, 9.2-22, 9.2-23 and 9.2-24 of Resource Report 9 and Appendix 9-J have been updated to add NSA-6 to the analysis and the results still conclude that all sounds levels due to the proposed Swann CS equipment will be lower than 55 dBA L_{dn} at all nearby NSAs and that the Swann Compressor Station will be in full compliance with FERC noise requirements. The updated analysis with NSA-6 added to Tables 9.2-8, 9.2-22, 9.2-23 and 9.2-24 and an updated Appendix 9-J are provided in Attachment 9-8.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 9

> Provide a large scale (1:3,600 or greater) plot plan, filed as both "public" and "CEII", if necessary, identifying the proposed engine/compressor units, gas cooling fans, blowdown stacks, buildings, piping and other equipment, site property line, and nearby noise-sensitive areas.

Response:

> MVP is providing a map of each compressor station in Attachment 9-9, including the distance of nearby NSAs from the compressor station limits of disturbance or compressor station pad, which represents a conservative distance of the NSAs from station equipment.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 9

Question 10

> Confirm that Mountain Valley intends to implement the mitigation measures recommended by SLR in the noise analyses for the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth, and Swann CSs identified in appendices 9-G, 9-H, 9-I, and 9-J, including the recommended building construction.

Response:

> MVP will implement the mitigation measures necessary to meet applicable noise level requirements as recommended by SLR.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 10

Question 1

Provide further quantitative information for the Swann CS site alternatives 1-4 or additional viable location alternatives that would satisfy required hydraulics, site size, and would be available for purchase. The alternative analysis should compare elements such as:

a. site acres and type of land affected (e.g., forested/woodland, open, agricultural, developed, open water);
b. acres of any prime farmland;
c. number of noise sensitive areas (NSA) within 1 mile;
d. turbine/engine/motor horsepower amount;
e. length of electric power line or other non-jurisdictional facilities necessary to operate the facilities;
f. length of associated pipeline lateral and suction/discharge line;
g. number of waterbodies and acres of wetlands affected; and
h. floodplain designation.

Mountain Valley may supplement its response with additional information that may be relevant to the analysis of the alternative and/or with suggested modifications to the site that would result in fewer environmental impacts.

Response:

The requested information is included in revised Table 10.4-1 included in Attachment 10-1.

Respondent: Megan Neylon
Position: Regional Manager II Permitting
Phone Number: (724) 873-3645
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 10

Question 2

Provide the following information related to electric motor-driven alternatives for the compressor stations:

a. Update table 10.5-1 to include the comparison of emissions of PM2.5 for an electric motor-driven alternative.

b. Provide a feasibility analysis and comparison of using grid-sourced electricity to power electric motor/compressor packages (and other equipment) at the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth CSs. This analysis should include available electric grid emission data using the latest version of the EPA's AVoided Emissions and geneRation Tool (AVERT) software. Pollutants analyzed should include SO_2, NOx, CO_2, and $PM_{2.5}$.

c. Provide a quantitative analysis of environmental resources impacted from using an electric motor-driven compression alternative for all compressor stations compared to the proposed facilities. This should include a description of, but is not limited to, acres and type of land affected, sensitive resources that would be crossed, length of required transmission line.

Response:

a. An updated Table 10.5-1 that includes comparison of emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ for an electric motor-driven alternative is included in Attachment 10-2-a. Please note that there are no official eGrid $PM_{2.5}$ emissions; therefore, a grid emissions factor from the EPA (2023) draft white paper was used for analysis. The analysis shows a very slight decrease in $PM_{2.5}$ emissions using electric motor drivers powered by the grid.

b. Tables 10-2b-1 through 10-2b-3 below provide analysis for the Bradshaw, Harris, and Stallworth Compressor Stations using emissions from the EPA AVert tool. SO_2, NOx, CO_2, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would increase by using grid-sourced electricity to power electric motor/compressor packages. This analysis considers the compression proposed as part of this Project and does not assess replacing the existing equipment.

Table 10-2b-1
Comparison of Emissions from Bradshaw Compressor Station Electric Motor-Driven Alternative

Pollutant	Compressor Driver Total HP at Site Conditions	Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MW)	Annual Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MWh)	Annual Compressor Driver Emissions Using Grid Power (tons)	Potential to Emit Annual Emissions for Natural Gas Turbines (tons)	Emissions Increase Using Grid Power
CO_2	23,483	22.9	200,602	136,575	91,061	50%
SO_2				57	2.6	2,074%
NO_X				50	25.9	94%
$PM_{2.5}$				8	7.7	9%

lbs = pounds, MW = megawatt, MWh = megawatt-hours, HP=horsepower

Table 10-2b-2
Comparison of Emissions from Harris Compressor Station Electric Motor-Driven Alternative

Pollutant	Compressor Driver Total HP at Site Conditions	Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MW)	Annual Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MWh)	Annual Compressor Driver Emissions Using Grid Power (tons)	Potential to Emit Annual Emissions for Natural Gas Turbines (tons)	Emissions Increase Using Grid Power
CO_2	56,590	55.2	483,416	329,213	197,001	67%
SO_2				138	5.7	2,330%
NO_X				122	56.1	117%
$PM_{2.5}$				20	16.7	22%

lbs = pounds, MW = megawatt, MWh = megawatt-hours, HP=horsepower

Table 10-2b-3
Comparison of Emissions from Stallworth Compressor Station Electric Motor-Driven Alternative

Pollutant	Compressor Driver Total HP at Site Conditions	Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MW)	Annual Compressor Driver Power Input Required (MWh)	Annual Compressor Driver Emissions Using Grid Power (tons)	Potential to Emit Annual Emissions for Natural Gas Turbines (tons)	Emissions Increase Using Grid Power
CO_2	44,748	43.6	382,257	260,276	173,620	50%
SO_2				109	5.0	2,075%
NO_X				96	49.4	94%
$PM_{2.5}$				16	14.8	9%

lbs = pounds, MW = megawatt, MWh = megawatt-hours, HP=horsepower

c. A comparison of an electric motor-driven compression alternative for all compressor stations is provided in Table 10-2c and summarized below. Alternatives are conceptual and would be subject to utility company transmission studies to determine if there is sufficient system capacity to support them. The utility company would make the final decision as to the access point on their system.

Bradshaw Compressor Station

The Bradshaw Compressor Station is located within the service area of Mon Power, a FirstEnergy Company. An electric motor-driven compression alternative would require an estimated capacity of 22 megavolt amperes (MVA). The nearest high-voltage (HV) transmission line suitable to supply the required power level is a 138 kilovolt (kV) line, located approximately 2.5 miles to the northwest (straight line distance).

The typical right-of-way required for a 138-kV transmission line in a rural area would be 100 feet wide, resulting in approximately 31 acres of land clearing for this alternative. The motor driven compressor station alternative would also require an additional area of approximately 2 acres to be acquired, cleared, and leveled to accommodate the circuit breakers, transformers and support infrastructure for an HV substation to provide power at a voltage level usable by the compressor station.

Harris Compressor Station

The Harris Compressor Station is also located within the service area of Mon Power and an electric motor-driven compression alternative would require an estimated capacity of 33 MVA. The nearest HV transmission line suitable to supply the required power level is a 138-kV line, located approximately 3.4 miles to the northwest (straight line distance). The right-of-way for the additional transmission line would result in approximately 41 additional acres land clearing. As with Bradshaw Compressor Station, the electric motor-driven compressor station alternative would also require approximately 2 acres for an HV substation.

Table 10-2c
Environmental Resource Impacts from Electric Motor-Driven Compression Alternatives

Feature	Bradshaw Electric Alternative	Bradshaw Proposed	Harris Electric Alternative	Harris Proposed	Stallworth Electric Alternative	Stallworth Proposed	Swann Electric Alternative	Swann Proposed
High-voltage electric transmission line approximate length (miles)	2.5	0.0	3.4	0.0	6.9	0.0	2.5	0.0
Electric power service footprint (acres) a/	33.1	0.0	43.0	0.0	82.1	0.0	34	0.0
Compressor station footprint (acres) b/	6.3	6.3	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.4	25.4	25.4
Total combined power service and station footprint (acres)	39.4	6.3	48.6	5.6	88.5	6.4	59.4	25.4
Land use affected	Forested, Developed	Developed	Forested, Developed	Developed	Forested, Developed	Developed, open	Forest, scrub, open	Forest, scrub, open
Forested land affected (acres)	28.8	0	33.4	0	57.8	0	36.9	13.8
Wetlands (NWI) crossed (acres) c/	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0.3	0
Waterbodies (NHD) crossed (number) d/	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Notes:
a/ Footprint of electric motor driven alternatives is based on estimated length of high-voltage (> 34.5 kV) electric transmission line service with an assumed 100-foot-wide right-of-way and associated electric substation.
b/ The footprint for an electric motor driven alternative would be the same as the proposed natural gas driven compression at each station.
c/ NWI = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory
d/ NHD = U.S. Geological Survey National Hydrography Dataset

Stallworth Compressor Station

The Stallworth Compressor Station is located within the service area of AEP Appalachian Power and an electric motor-driven compression alternative would require an estimated capacity of 33 MVA. The nearest HV transmission line suitable to supply the required power level is a 69 kV line, located approximately 6.9 miles to the west (straight line distance). A 69-kV transmission line in a rural area would also have a 100-foot right-of-way, resulting in an additional 80 acres of land clearing, plus approximately 2 acres for an HV substation, similar to the other compressor station sites.

Swann Compressor Station

The Swann Compressor Station is located within the service area of AEP Appalachian Power and an electric motor-driven compression alternative would require an estimated capacity of 90 MVA. The nearest HV transmission line suitable to supply the required power level is a 138-kV line, located approximately 2.5 miles to the south (straight line distance). The transmission line right-of-way would require an additional 32 acres, plus approximately 2 acres for an HV substation, similar to the other compressor station sites. Table 10-2c also summarizes an electric motor-driven compression alternative for the Swann alternative site locations.

References:

EPA (Environmental Protection Agency. 2023. Particulate Matter Emissions for eGRID2021. Draft White Paper. Available online at: https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2024-06/egrid2021-draft-pm-memo.pdf. Accessed online February 10, 2026.

Respondent: James Knibloe
Position: Engineer Senior
Phone Number: (412) 553-5893
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 11

Question 1

Provide the potential impact radius for the suction and discharge lines at the Bradshaw, Harris, Stallworth, and Swann CSs and include any supporting calculations.

Response:

Per 49 CFR 192.903, the potential impact radius (PIR) for 42" diameter pipe with a MAOP of 1480 psig is 1,115 ft. This can be calculated by using the equation included in the reference cited above:

$$r = 0.69 \cdot \sqrt{p \cdot d^2}$$

where 'r' is the radius of a circular area in feet surrounding the point of failure, 'p' is the MAOP in the pipeline segment in pounds per square inch, and 'd' is the nominal diameter of the pipeline in inches.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC
MVP Boost Project
Docket No. CP26-14-000

Responses to FERC Office of Energy Projects Environmental Information Request 1
Dated January 29, 2026

Request:

Resource Report 11

Question 2

> Several commenters noted traffic and safety concerns regarding emergency response and community evacuation near the Swann CS due to the proximity of the train tracks along Roanoke Road. Provide information on the outcome of Mountain Valley's consultations with local fire departments and emergency response agencies relative to whether additional equipment, training, and support are needed during the construction and operation of the Swann CS.

Response:

> Project team members have had and are continuing to have ongoing conversations with local officials, including first-responders and public safety agencies, about the proposed Project and how to work collaboratively to ensure the safe construction and operation of the proposed facilities. This includes making officials aware of MVP's ongoing grant program (see https://www.mvpboost.info/community) and the Project team's commitment to ensuring first-responders are properly equipped to protect people and property in the vicinity of the proposed Project. MVP has also been in communication with Norfolk Southern regarding its procedures for stopping trains at this location.

Respondent: Ashley Merks
Position: Project Manager
Phone Number: (724) 873-2865
Date: February 13, 2026

VERIFICATION

Pursuant to Rule 2005 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission"), 18 C.F.R. § 385.2005, James Knibloe, being duly sworn, upon his oath says that he is Engineer Senior; that he has read and is familiar with the foregoing updated response to the Commission's January 29, 2026 data request; that the contents of the response are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief; and that he has full power and authority to prepare the response and execute this verification.

Signed by:
James Knibloe
5000F15BFC65418...

James Knibloe
Engineer Senior

VERIFICATION

Pursuant to Rule 2005 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission"), 18 C.F.R. § 385.2005, Ashley Merks, being duly sworn, upon her oath says that she is Project Manager; that she has read and is familiar with the foregoing updated response to the Commission's January 29, 2026 data request; that the contents of the response are true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information and belief; and that she has full power and authority to prepare the response and execute this verification.

Signed by:
Ashley Merks
572E4B6784C74F5...

Ashley Merks
Project Manager

VERIFICATION

Pursuant to Rule 2005 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission"), 18 C.F.R. § 385.2005, Megan Neylon, being duly sworn, upon her oath says that she is Regional Manager II Permitting; that she has read and is familiar with the foregoing updated response to the Commission's January 29, 2026 data request; that the contents of the response are true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information and belief; and that she has full power and authority to prepare the response and execute this verification.

Signed by:
Megan Neylon
085C146A165449A...

Megan Neylon
Regional Manager II Permitting