

Senator Tim Kaine
388 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Senator Kaine:

Along with many people in our beautiful region, I am very concerned about the harmful impacts of the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). Please act now to take concrete steps to better protect my safety, health, and property from the threats to our water, climate, and economy.

The FERC “regulatory process” is failing. Despite the recommendation of many authorities, FERC stated in their June Project Update that they would not include any other pipelines proposed for Virginia in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being produced for the ACP. A “programmatic” EIS (PEIS) that investigates the need and impacts of all the pipelines proposed through our region *in a single document* is simply common sense. It is nothing short of an outrage that FERC is proceeding with separate analyses. A recent Roanoke Times editorial put it well: “If we compare [new pipelines] with the interstate highway system, it would be as if we allowed private turnpike companies to build large highways through our region with no entrance or exit ramps and no overall sense of which highways are most needed—with private companies taking property from local residents and businesses and reaping all the profit.”

According to FERC’s own regulations, the need for new pipelines must be high enough to justify all the impacts. How can a review system that allows multiple pipelines to meet the same “need,” and considers the impacts of each pipeline in isolation accurately measure need or impact? FERC also indicated in their June update that “only environmental issues” would be addressed in the EIS, and that their review of “alternatives” would be limited to *alternative routes*. Other concerns or the consideration of whether so many pipelines are even necessary, would remain unaddressed until their Order was issued. At that point, the public’s only option would be litigation—which might not halt the destruction.

Senator Kaine, please help protect the public. Demand that FERC:

- Prepare a “Programmatic” Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that analyzes *in a single document* the need and impacts of *all* the massive, high-pressure, transmission pipelines currently proposed to run through Virginia.
- Evaluate the public benefits of likely *end-uses* for the ACP, not just the *current contracts*—OR Insist FERC make the *Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity* for the ACP conditional on **domestic use only**—Include this in the draft PEIS, to enable public inspection and comment.
- Look to the enormous potential of renewable energy and increased efficiency to meet increased power demands. (In a June article “Why are the government’s energy forecasts so bad?” *Politico* exposed the failure of the Energy Information Administration to accurately predict the potential of renewables, exponentially underestimating their demand, based on projects in the works.)

Please let me know how you intend to respond to the threat posed by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline to your constituents. I would like to hear *specific responses* to the points and requests made in this letter.

Signed: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address: _____

Senator Mark Warner
475 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Senator Warner:

Along with many people in our beautiful region, I am very concerned about the harmful impacts of the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). Please act now to take concrete steps to better protect my safety, health, and property from the threats to our water, climate, and economy.

The FERC “regulatory process” is failing. Despite the recommendation of many authorities, FERC stated in their June Project Update that they would not include any other pipelines proposed for Virginia in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being produced for the ACP. A “programmatically” EIS (PEIS) that investigates the need and impacts of all the pipelines proposed through our region *in a single document* is simply common sense. It is nothing short of an outrage that FERC is proceeding with separate analyses. A recent Roanoke Times editorial put it well: “If we compare [new pipelines] with the interstate highway system, it would be as if we allowed private turnpike companies to build large highways through our region with no entrance or exit ramps and no overall sense of which highways are most needed—with private companies taking property from local residents and businesses and reaping all the profit.”

According to FERC’s own regulations, the need for new pipelines must be high enough to justify all the impacts. How can a review system that allows multiple pipelines to meet the same “need,” and considers the impacts of each pipeline in isolation accurately measure need or impact? FERC also indicated in their June update that “only environmental issues” would be addressed in the EIS, and that their review of “alternatives” would be limited to *alternative routes*. Other concerns or the consideration of whether so many pipelines are even necessary, would remain unaddressed until their Order was issued. At that point, the public’s only option would be litigation—which might not halt the destruction.

Senator Warner, please help protect the public. Demand that FERC:

- Prepare a “Programmatically” Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that analyzes *in a single document* the need and impacts of *all* the massive, high-pressure, transmission pipelines currently proposed to run through Virginia.
- Evaluate the public benefits of likely *end-uses* for the ACP, not just the *current contracts*—OR Insist FERC make the *Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity* for the ACP conditional on **domestic use only**—Include this in the draft PEIS, to enable public inspection and comment.
- Look to the enormous potential of renewable energy and increased efficiency to meet increased power demands. (In a June article “Why are the government’s energy forecasts so bad?” *Politico* exposed the failure of the Energy Information Administration to accurately predict the potential of renewables, exponentially underestimating their demand, based on projects in the works.)

Please let me know how you intend to respond to the threat posed by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline to your constituents. I would like to hear *specific responses* to the points and requests made in this letter.

Signed: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address: _____

Representative Robert Hurt
125 Cannon HOB
Washington, DC 20515

Representative Hurt:

Along with many people in our beautiful region, I am very concerned about the harmful impacts of the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). Please act now to take concrete steps to better protect my safety, health, and property from the threats to our water, climate, and economy.

The FERC “regulatory process” is failing. Despite the recommendation of many authorities, FERC stated in their June Project Update that they would not include any other pipelines proposed for Virginia in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being produced for the ACP. A “programmatically” EIS (PEIS) that investigates the need and impacts of all the pipelines proposed through our region *in a single document* is simply common sense. It is nothing short of an outrage that FERC is proceeding with separate analyses. A recent Roanoke Times editorial put it well: “If we compare [new pipelines] with the interstate highway system, it would be as if we allowed private turnpike companies to build large highways through our region with no entrance or exit ramps and no overall sense of which highways are most needed—with private companies taking property from local residents and businesses and reaping all the profit.”

According to FERC’s own regulations, the need for new pipelines must be high enough to justify all the impacts. How can a review system that allows multiple pipelines to meet the same “need,” and considers the impacts of each pipeline in isolation accurately measure need or impact? FERC also indicated in their June update that “only environmental issues” would be addressed in the EIS, and that their review of “alternatives” would be limited to *alternative routes*. Other concerns or the consideration of whether so many pipelines are even necessary, would remain unaddressed until their Order was issued. At that point, the public’s only option would be litigation—which might not halt the destruction.

Representative Hurt, please help protect the public. Demand that FERC:

- Prepare a “Programmatically” Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that analyzes *in a single document* the need and impacts of *all* the massive, high-pressure, transmission pipelines currently proposed to run through Virginia.
- Evaluate the public benefits of likely *end-uses* for the ACP, not just the *current contracts*—OR Insist FERC make the *Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity* for the ACP conditional on ***domestic use only***—Include this in the draft PEIS, to enable public inspection and comment.
- Look to the enormous potential of renewable energy and increased efficiency to meet increased power demands. (In a June article “Why are the government’s energy forecasts so bad?” *Politico* exposed the failure of the Energy Information Administration to accurately predict the potential of renewables, exponentially underestimating their demand, based on projects in the works.)

Please let me know how you intend to respond to the threat posed by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline to your constituents. I would like to hear *specific responses* to the points and requests made in this letter.

Signed: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address: _____

Governor Terry McAuliffe
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Governor McAuliffe:

Along with many people in our beautiful region, I am very concerned about the harmful impacts of the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). Please act now to take concrete steps to better protect my safety, health, and property from the threats to our water, climate, and economy.

The FERC “regulatory process” is failing. Despite the recommendation of many authorities, FERC stated in their June Project Update that they would not include any other pipelines proposed for Virginia in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being produced for the ACP. A “programmatically” EIS (PEIS) that investigates the need and impacts of all the pipelines proposed through our region *in a single document* is simply common sense. It is nothing short of an outrage that FERC is proceeding with separate analyses. A recent Roanoke Times editorial put it well: “If we compare [new pipelines] with the interstate highway system, it would be as if we allowed private turnpike companies to build large highways through our region with no entrance or exit ramps and no overall sense of which highways are most needed—with private companies taking property from local residents and businesses and reaping all the profit.”

According to FERC’s own regulations, the need for new pipelines must be high enough to justify all the impacts. How can a review system that allows multiple pipelines to meet the same “need,” and considers the impacts of each pipeline in isolation accurately measure need or impact? FERC also indicated in their June update that “only environmental issues” would be addressed in the EIS, and that their review of “alternatives” would be limited to *alternative routes*. Other concerns or the consideration of whether so many pipelines are even necessary, would remain unaddressed until their Order was issued. At that point, the public’s only option would be litigation—which might not halt the destruction.

Governor McAuliffe, please help protect the public. Demand that FERC:

- Prepare a “Programmatically” Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that analyzes *in a single document* the need and impacts of *all* the massive, high-pressure, transmission pipelines currently proposed to run through Virginia.
- Evaluate the public benefits of likely *end-uses* for the ACP, not just the *current contracts*—OR Insist FERC make the *Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity* for the ACP conditional on **domestic use only**—Include this in the draft PEIS, to enable public inspection and comment.
- Look to the enormous potential of renewable energy and increased efficiency to meet increased power demands. (In a June article “Why are the government’s energy forecasts so bad?” *Politico* exposed the failure of the Energy Information Administration to accurately predict the potential of renewables, exponentially underestimating their demand, based on projects in the works.)

Please let me know how you intend to respond to the threat posed by the Atlantic Coast Pipeline to your constituents. I would like to hear *specific responses* to the points and requests made in this letter.

Signed: _____

Printed Name: _____

Address: _____
