To the Party Addressed:

You are receiving this letter because the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) is evaluating seven new route modifications to Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC’s (Atlantic) proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) route in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina. Atlantic has incorporated the below route modifications into its proposed route since the filing of its September 18, 2015 application to address comments that have been filed in the public record for the ACP. Your property has been identified as potentially being affected by the path of one of the route modifications.

**Summary of Cheat Mountain Route Modification**

To reduce residential impacts, avoid side slope construction, and reduce potential impacts on the Cheat Mountain salamander, Atlantic incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-1 mileposts (MPs) 67.4 and 68.8 in the Monongahela National Forest in Randolph County, West Virginia. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Cheat Mountain Route Modification initially heads east for 0.2 mile to an existing Monongahela Power Company 138 kV electric transmission line. The new route parallels the west side of the existing electric transmission line for approximately 0.2 mile, then heads south/southeast for approximately 0.3 mile, crossing Shavers Fork and passing south of a private residence. The new route then crosses to the east side of the existing electric transmission line corridor and parallels the transmission line to the southeast for approximately 0.7 mile until it joins the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application at AP-1 MP 68.8.

**Summary of Cow Knob HDD Route Modification**

In response to comments raised by the U.S. Forest Service to avoid potential impacts on the cow knob salamander, Atlantic has incorporated a route modification and two horizontal directional drill (HDD) segments into its proposed pipeline route between AP-1 MPs 108.8 and 113.2 in the George Washington National Forest in Highland and
Augusta Counties, Virginia. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Cow Knob Route Modification initially heads east along a valley for approximately 0.5 mile to the first HDD location on the west side of Shenandoah Mountain. From this point, the pipeline would be installed by HDD beneath Shenandoah Mountain for approximately 1.3 miles and would exit the east side of the mountain in a valley along an unnamed tributary to Hodges Draft. The new route modification then continues southeast for approximately 0.5 mile adjacent to an unnamed tributary to Hodges Draft and then heads to the northwest for approximately 0.6 mile to the second HDD location. From this point the pipeline would be installed by HDD beneath a south trending ridge of Signal Corps Knob for 1.1 miles and would exit in a valley along Leslie Lick Hollow. The new route then continues southeast for 0.2 mile until it joins the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application at AP-1 MP 113.2. An approximate 0.5-mile-long workspace east of the HDD exit point near Leslie Lick Hollow would be required to fabricate the pipeline for the second HDD.

Summary of Augusta County Service Authority Route Modification

In response to comments raised by the Augusta County Service Authority to avoid potential impacts on the Lyndhurst Source Water Protection Area (SWPA), Atlantic has incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-1 MPs 147.1 and 152.2 in Augusta County, Virginia. The route modification is shown in Enclosure 1. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Augusta County Service Authority Route Modification initially heads southeast near Mount Vernon Road for approximately 1.7 miles, where it crosses Patton Farms Road, then crosses Lyndhurst Road at Schages Lane, between two existing residential subdivisions. The new route then continues to the south for approximately 2.1 miles through undeveloped land until it joins the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application on the north side of the Howardsville Turnpike.

Summary of Warminster/Swift Island Route Modification

To reduce impacts within the Swift Island Mitigation Site and the newly identified Warminster rural historic district, Atlantic incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-1 MPs 184.1 and 186.6 in Nelson and Buckingham Counties, Virginia. The route modification is shown in Enclosure 1. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Warminster/Swift Island Route Modification initially heads east for 0.2 mile to a HDD point west of the historic district and the James River. The pipeline would then be installed by HDD beneath a portion of the Warminster rural historic district and the James River for approximately 0.5 mile and would exit on the east side of the James River and north of the Swift Island Mitigation Site. The new route then gradually turns to the southeast to avoid active wetland mitigation areas and designated stream buffer within the Swift Island Mitigation Site, and joins the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application south of Woodland Church Road near AP-1 MP 186.6.
Summary of Franklin Route Modification

To avoid an existing conservation easement held by Virginia Outdoors Foundation, Atlantic incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-3 MPs 44.4 and 45.5 in the City of Suffolk, Virginia. The route modification is shown in Enclosure 1. The Franklin Route Modification is located approximately 0.1 mile to the south of the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application.

Summary of Great Dismal Swamp Major Route Modification

To avoid crossing the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge (GDSNWR), Atlantic incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-3 MPs 49.8 and 72.7 in the Cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake, Virginia. The route modification is shown in Enclosure 1. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Great Dismal Swamp Major Route Modification initially heads north-northeast for approximately 9.9 miles to a point just north of Pruden Boulevard in Suffolk. The new route then heads east for approximately 12.0 miles, passing north of Suffolk and crossing two segments of the Western Branch Reservoir. After passing north of the Hampton Roads Airport, the new route turns south-southeast for approximately 2.0 miles and joins the originally proposed pipeline route in Atlantic’s application at AP-3 MP 165.7. Three smaller route modification are east of this location. The first route modification is located between AP-3 MPs 67.9 and 68.2 and avoids the GDSNWR by paralleling the north side of West Military Highway for 0.1 mile, then crossing from the north to south side of the highway on privately owned lands east of the GDSNWR boundary. The second route modification occurs between AP-3 MPs 69.2 and 70.1 and avoids the GDSNWR by paralleling an existing natural gas pipeline for an additional 0.6 mile, then heads 0.3 mile south on privately owned lands east of the GDSNWR boundary. The third route modification is between AP-3 MPs 72.3 and 72.7 and avoids the GDSNWR by paralleling the Norfolk and Western Railroad for an additional 0.2 mile, then crossing from the north to the south side of the railroad on privately owned lands east of the GDSNWR boundary.

Summary of Little River Route Modification

In response to comments raised by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Atlantic has incorporated a route modification into its proposed pipeline route between AP-2 MPs 82.3 and 83.8 in Johnston County, North Carolina. The route modification is shown in Enclosure 1. Relative to Atlantic’s originally proposed route, the Little River Route Modification initially heads southwest, crossing the Little River, and passing south of Buffalo Creek before joining the originally proposed route in Atlantic’s application.
FERC’s Environmental Review Process

The staff of the FERC is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will address the environmental impacts of construction and operation of the facilities proposed by Atlantic. This EIS will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether the ACP is in the public convenience and necessity. Part of the analysis in the EIS includes the assessment of alternative pipeline routes. These route modifications would affect landowners that have not been part of the FERC’s environmental scoping process. Therefore, by this letter we are notifying you of our evaluation and requesting your comments about these new route modifications. The Commission staff’s analysis of the route modifications and the staff’s recommendations regarding these route modifications will be included in the draft EIS.

On February 27, 2015, FERC staff issued a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Supply Header Project and Atlantic Coast Pipeline Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings (NOI). The NOI includes more information regarding the ACP and is provided in Enclosure 2; however, the NOI did not consider the modifications identified in this letter.

A fact sheet prepared by the FERC entitled “An Interstate Natural Gas Facility On My Land? What Do I Need To Know?” is available for viewing on the FERC website (http://www.ferc.gov/resources/guides.asp). This fact sheet addresses a number of typically-asked questions, including the use of eminent domain and how to participate in the Commission’s proceedings.

Public Participation Opportunity

The Commission staff wants to provide all newly identified potentially affected landowners along the route modifications with the opportunity to participate in our environmental review process. We are also sending this letter to those landowners whose property was previously crossed by the ACP project route identified in its September 18, 2015 application.

You are encouraged to become involved in this process and provide your specific comments or concerns about these new route modifications and the ACP. Please file your comments so they are received in Washington, DC, by December 14, 2015. Your comments should focus on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. To expedite the receipt and consideration of your comments, electronic submission of comments is strongly encouraged. See the Public Participation section of Enclosure 2 (NOI) for instructions on how to file electronic comments.
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If you wish to mail comments, please carefully follow these instructions:

- Send your letter to:

  Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
  Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
  888 First St. NE, Room 1A
  Washington, DC 20426

- Reference Docket No. CP15-554-000 on the original and both copies.

- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, DC on or before December 14, 2015.

If you are receiving this letter in the mail, you have been added to our current environmental mailing list for this Project and will continue to receive project updates, Notices, and the draft EIS/final EIS. To reduce printing and mailing costs, the draft EIS will be issued in both CD and hard copy formats. If you do not inform us otherwise, you will receive a CD copy of the EIS. Interested parties that have filed comments or received our original February 27, 2015 NOI will continue to receive official mailings.

As indicated in the FERC’s Notice of Application issued on October 2, 2015, the deadline for motions to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10) closed on October 23, 2015. However, those individuals who were not previously noticed in this proceeding may request to intervene out of time, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214(d).

If you have further questions about the project or about your participation in this proceeding, please call the FERC’s Office of External Affairs at 1-866-208-FERC.

Sincerely,

David Swearingen, Chief
Gas Branch 4
Office of Energy Projects

cc: Public File
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Enclosure 2
Notice of Intent
NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PLANNED
SUPPLY HEADER PROJECT AND ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE PROJECT,
REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES,
AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

(February 27, 2015)

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the Supply Header Project (SHP) involving construction and operation of facilities by Dominion Transmission, Inc. (Dominion) in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and the Atlantic Coast Pipeline Project (ACP Project) involving construction and operation of facilities by Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC (Atlantic) in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina. The environmental impacts of both projects will be considered in one EIS, which will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether the projects are in the public convenience and necessity.

This notice announces the opening of the scoping process the Commission will use to gather input from the public and interested agencies on the projects. Your input will help the Commission staff determine what issues they need to evaluate in the EIS. Please note that the scoping period will close on April 28, 2015.

You may submit comments in written form or verbally. Further details on how to submit written comments are in the Public Participation section of this notice. If you sent comments on the SHP or ACP Projects to the Commission before the opening of the dockets on October 31, 2014, you will need to file those comments under Docket No. PF15-5-000 or PF15-6-000 to ensure they are considered as part of this proceeding. In lieu of or in addition to sending written comments, the Commission invites you to attend any of the public scoping meetings scheduled as follows:
The purpose of these scoping meetings is to provide an opportunity to verbally comment on the projects. If a significant number of people are interested in commenting at the meetings, we\(^1\) may establish a 3- to 5-minute time limit for each commentor to ensure that all people wishing to comment have the opportunity in the time allotted for the meeting. If time limits on comments are implemented, they will be strictly enforced. A transcript of each meeting will be added to the Commission’s administrative record to ensure that your comments are accurately recorded.

This notice is being sent to the Commission’s current environmental mailing list for these projects. State and local government representatives should notify their constituents of these planned projects and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

\(^1\) “We,” “us,” and “our” refer to the environmental staff of the Commission’s Office of Energy Projects.
If you are a landowner receiving this notice, a pipeline company representative may contact you about the acquisition of an easement to construct, operate, and maintain the planned facilities. The company would seek to negotiate a mutually acceptable agreement. However, if the Commission approves the projects, that approval conveys with it the right of eminent domain. Therefore, if easement negotiations fail to produce an agreement, the pipeline company could initiate condemnation proceedings where compensation would be determined in accordance with state law.

A fact sheet prepared by the FERC entitled “An Interstate Natural Gas Facility On My Land? What Do I Need To Know?” is available for viewing on the FERC website (www.ferc.gov). This fact sheet addresses a number of typically asked questions, including the use of eminent domain and how to participate in the Commission's proceedings.

Summary of the Planned Projects

The SHP would involve the construction and operation of approximately 38.7 miles of pipeline loop and the modification of existing compression facilities in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The pipeline facilities associated with the SHP would be comprised of two main components: 1) approximately 3.8 miles of 30-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline loop adjacent to Dominion’s existing LN-25 pipeline in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania; and 2) approximately 34.9 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline loop adjacent to Dominion’s existing TL-360 pipeline in Harrison, Doddridge, Tyler, and Wetzel Counties, West Virginia.

In addition to the planned pipelines, Dominion plans to modify four existing compressor stations in Westmoreland and Green Counties, Pennsylvania and Marshall and Wetzel Counties, West Virginia. Dominion would install new gas-fired turbines that would provide for a combined increase of 75,700 horsepower of compression. Dominion would also install new valves, pig launcher/receiver sites, and associated appurtenances at these existing compressor station locations.

The ACP Project would involve the construction and operation of 554 miles of variable diameter natural gas pipeline in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina. The pipeline facilities associated with the ACP Project would be comprised of four main components as follows:

2 A pipeline “loop” is a segment of pipe constructed parallel to an existing pipeline to increase capacity.
3 A “pig” is a tool that the pipeline company inserts into and pushes through the pipeline for cleaning the pipeline, conducting internal inspections, or other purposes.
approximately 295.6 miles of 42-inch-diameter pipeline in Harrison, Lewis, Upshur, Randolph, and Pocahontas Counties, West Virginia; Highland, Augusta, Nelson, Buckingham, Cumberland, Prince Edward, Nottoway, Dinwiddie, Brunswick, and Greensville Counties, Virginia; and Northampton County, North Carolina;

- approximately 179.9 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline in Northampton, Halifax, Nash, Wilson, Johnston, Sampson, Cumberland, and Robeson Counties, North Carolina;

- approximately 75.7 miles of 20-inch-diameter lateral pipeline in Northampton County, North Carolina; and Greensville, Southampton, Suffolk, and Chesapeake Counties, Virginia; and

- approximately 3.1 miles of 16-inch-diameter natural gas lateral pipeline in Brunswick County, Virginia.

In addition to the planned pipelines, Atlantic plans to construct and operate three new compressor stations totaling 108,275 horsepower of compression. These compressor stations would be located in Lewis County, West Virginia; Buckingham County, Virginia; and Northampton County, North Carolina. Atlantic would also install metering stations, valves, pig launcher/receiver sites, and associated appurtenances along the planned pipeline system.

The SHP and ACP Projects would be capable of delivering 1.5 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day to seven planned distribution points in West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina. If approved, construction of the projects is proposed to begin in September 2016. The general location of the projects’ facilities and a number of alternatives under consideration are shown in the maps in appendix 1.

4 The appendices referenced in this notice will not appear in the Federal Register. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail and are available at www.ferc.gov using the link called “eLibrary” or from the Commission’s Public Reference Room, 888 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 502-8371. For instructions on connecting to eLibrary, refer to the last page of this notice.
Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the planned facilities would disturb about 12,972 acres of land for the pipeline and aboveground facilities. The typical construction right-of-way for pipeline facilities would vary between 125 feet wide for the 42-inch-diameter pipeline and 75 feet wide for the 16-inch-diameter lateral pipeline, with additional workspace needed in some locations due to site-specific conditions. Following construction, approximately 4,370 acres of land would be retained for permanent operation of the facilities. Land affected by construction but not required for operation would generally be allowed to revert to former uses.

The EIS Process

The FERC will be the lead federal agency for the preparation of the EIS. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is participating as a cooperating agency because the ACP Project would cross the Monongahela and George Washington National Forests in West Virginia and Virginia. As a cooperating agency, the USFS intends to adopt the EIS per Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1506.3 to meet its responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regarding Atlantic’s planned application for a Right-of-Way Grant and Temporary Use Permit for crossing federally administered lands. The USFS additionally will assess how the planned pipeline conforms to the direction contained in the Monongahela and George Washington National Forests’ Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP). Changes in the LRMP could be required if the pipeline is authorized across the National Forests. The EIS will provide the documentation to support any needed amendments to the LRMPs.

NEPA requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. This process is referred to as scoping. The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EIS on the important environmental issues. By this notice, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues to address in the EIS. We will consider all filed comments during the preparation of the EIS.

In the EIS we will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the planned projects under these general headings:

- geology and soils;
- land use;
- water resources, fisheries, and wetlands;
- cultural resources;
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- vegetation and wildlife;
- air quality and noise;
- endangered and threatened species;
- socioeconomics; and
- public safety.

We will present our recommendations in the EIS on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas, as applicable.

Dominion and Atlantic are evaluating several route alternatives that were developed through the company’s route selection and constraint analysis processes or identified by stakeholders during public outreach efforts. Major route alternatives that have been identified by Dominion and Atlantic are presented in appendix 1. More detailed maps of these, and other, potential alternative routes can be found on the FERC website at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov), or Dominion’s website at [https://www.dom.com/corporate/what-we-do/natural-gas/atlantic-coast-pipeline](https://www.dom.com/corporate/what-we-do/natural-gas/atlantic-coast-pipeline). Part of our NEPA analysis will include evaluating possible alternatives to the planned projects or portions of the projects. Thus, as part of our scoping process, we are specifically soliciting comments on the range of alternatives for both of the projects.

Although no formal application has been filed, we have already initiated our NEPA review under the Commission’s pre-filing process. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to encourage early involvement of interested stakeholders and to identify and resolve issues before the FERC receives an application. As part of our pre-filing review, we have begun to contact some federal and state agencies to discuss their involvement in the scoping process and the preparation of the EIS.

The EIS will present our independent analysis of the issues. We will publish and distribute the draft EIS for public comment. After the comment period, we will consider all timely comments and revise the document, as necessary, before issuing a final EIS. To ensure we have the opportunity to consider and address your comments, please carefully follow the instructions in the Public Participation section beginning on page 8.

With this notice, we are asking agencies with jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise with respect to the environmental issues related to these projects to formally cooperate with us in the preparation of the EIS. Agencies that would like to request cooperating agency status should follow the instructions for filing comments provided under the Public Participation section of this notice. As discussed above, the USFS has expressed its intention to participate as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS.

---

5 The Council on Environmental Quality regulations addressing cooperating agency responsibilities are at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1501.6.
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to satisfy its NEPA responsibilities related to these projects. In addition to the USFS, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have also agreed to participate as cooperating agencies.

**Consultations Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act**

In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s implementing regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are using this notice to initiate consultation with the applicable State Historic Preservation Offices, and to solicit their views and those of other government agencies, interested Indian tribes, and the public on the projects’ potential effects on historic properties.\(^6\) We will define the project-specific Area of Potential Effects (APE) in consultation with the SHPOs as the projects develop. On natural gas facility projects, the APE at a minimum encompasses all areas subject to ground disturbance (examples include construction right-of-way, contractor/pipe storage yards, compressor stations, and access roads). Our EIS for these projects will document our findings on the impacts on historic properties and summarize the status of consultations under Section 106.

**Currently Identified Environmental Issues**

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the planned facilities and the environmental information provided by Dominion and Atlantic. This preliminary list of issues may change based on your comments and our analysis.

- land use impacts, including the exercise of eminent domain and future land use restrictions;
- impacts on property values, tourism, and recreational resources;
- safety issues, such as construction and operation of the planned facilities near existing residences, schools, businesses, and military training facilities, and in karst and steep slope terrain;

---

\(^6\) The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations are at Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800. Those regulations define historic properties as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.
alternatives, including routing within existing linear corridors, avoiding private property, National Forests, National Parkway lands, National Wildlife Refuge land, and other sensitive environmental features;

- impacts on local emergency management systems;
- impacts on forested areas and other vegetation;
- impacts on surface water resources including springs, seeps, and wetlands;
- impacts on groundwater resources and wells;
- impacts on protected species and habitat;
- impacts on cultural resources including battlefields, cemeteries, and historic properties; and
- concerns regarding construction and operational noise, especially related to compressor stations.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by providing us with your specific comments or concerns about the projects. Your comments should focus on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. To ensure that your comments are timely and properly recorded, please send your comments so that the Commission receives them in Washington, DC on or before April 28, 2015.

For your convenience, there are three methods you can use to submit your comments to the Commission. In all instances, please reference the appropriate project docket number(s) (PF15-5-000 for the SHP and PF15-6-000 for the ACP Project) with your submission. The Commission encourages electronic filing of comments and has expert staff available to assist you at (202) 502-8258 or efiling@ferc.gov.

(1) You can file your comments electronically using the eComment feature located on the Commission's website (www.ferc.gov) under the link to Documents and Filings. This is an easy method for interested persons to submit brief, text-only comments on a project;

(2) You can file your comments electronically using the eFiling feature located on the Commission's website (www.ferc.gov) under the link to Documents and Filings. With eFiling, you can provide comments in a variety of
formats by attaching them as a file with your submission. New eFiling users must first create an account by clicking on “eRegister.” You must select the type of filing you are making. If you are filing a comment on a particular project, please select “Comment on a Filing;” or

(3) You can file a paper copy of your comments by mailing them to the following address:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC  20426

**Environmental Mailing List**

The environmental mailing list includes federal, state, and local government representatives and agencies; elected officials; environmental and public interest groups; Native American Tribes; other interested parties; and local libraries and newspapers. This list also includes all affected landowners (as defined in the Commission’s regulations) who are potential right-of-way grantors, whose property may be used temporarily for project purposes, or who own homes within certain distances of aboveground facilities, as well as anyone who submits comments on the projects. We will update the environmental mailing list as the analysis proceeds to ensure that we send the information related to this environmental review to all individuals, organizations, and government entities interested in and/or potentially affected by the planned projects.

Copies of the completed draft EIS will be sent to the environmental mailing list for public review and comment. **If you would prefer to receive a paper copy of the document instead of the CD version or would like to remove your name from the mailing list, please return the attached Information Request (appendix 2).**

**Becoming an Intervenor**

Once Dominion and Atlantic file applications with the Commission, you may want to become an “intervenor,” which is an official party to the Commission’s proceeding. Intervenors play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings, and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal the Commission's final ruling. An intervenor formally participates in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene. Instructions for becoming an intervenor are in the User’s Guide under the “e-filing” link on the Commission’s website. Please note that the Commission will not accept requests for intervenor status at this time. You must wait until the Commission receives formal applications for the projects.
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**Additional Information**

Additional information about the projects is available from the Commission's Office of External Affairs, at (866) 208-FERC, or on the FERC website (www.ferc.gov) using the eLibrary link. Click on the eLibrary link, click on “General Search,” and enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the Docket Number field (i.e., PF15-5 or PF15-6). Be sure you have selected an appropriate date range. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659. The eLibrary link also provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission, such as orders, notices, and rulemakings.

In addition, the Commission offers a free service called eSubscription that allows you to keep track of all formal issuances and submittals in specific dockets. This can reduce the amount of time you spend researching proceedings by automatically providing you with notification of these filings, document summaries, and direct links to the documents. Go to www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp.

Finally, public meetings or site visits will be posted on the Commission’s calendar located at www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventsList.aspx along with other related information.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.
Figure 3
Atlantic Coast Pipeline Project and Supply Header Project
INFORMATION REQUEST

SUPPLY HEADER AND ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE PROJECTS

Name__________________________________________

Agency________________________________________

Address_______________________________________

City_______________________ State_____ Zip Code______

☐ Please send me a paper copy of the published NEPA document

☐ Please remove my name from the mailing list